arXiv:1704.04177v1 [math.PR] 13 Apr 2017

Super-Ricci flows and improved gradient and transport estimates

Eva Kopfer*

Abstract

We show that the heat flow on super-Ricci flows in the sense of Sturm in [22, 14] satisfies transport estimates with respect to every L^p-Kantorovich distance, $p \in [1, \infty]$. As an application we construct Brownian motions on time-dependent metric measure spaces and present transport estimates for their trajectories.

The proof is inspired by Savaré and Bakry in [19] and [5] respectively and takes advantage of the self-improvement of the gradient estimates. For this we prove a refined version of Bochner's inequality under strengthened assumptions on the metric.

1 Introduction and Statement of the main results

In [14] it has been shown that a family of metric measure spaces $(X, d_t, m_t)_{t\in I}$ is a super-Ricci flow if and only if the gradient estimate

$$\Gamma_t(P_{t,s}u) \leq P_{t,s}(\Gamma_s(u))$$

holds for every $u \in Dom(\mathcal{E})$ and every $0 < s < t < T$, or, equivalently by duality [15], if the L^2-Kantorovich transport estimate

$$W_{2,s}(\hat{P}_{t,s}\mu, \hat{P}_{t,s}\nu) \leq W_{2,t}(\mu, \nu) \tag{1}$$

holds for every $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ and every $0 \leq s < t \leq T$.

In this paper we improve the gradient estimate (and therefore the transport estimate) in the sense of Savaré [19] and Bakry [5] respectively. For this we aggravate our assumption regarding the time-dependence of the metric. We will restrict ourselves to metrics such that the map $t \mapsto \log d_t(x, y)$ is continuously differentiable (instead of Lipschitz continuous as in [14]) and its derivative $h_t(x, y)$ is continuous as $y \to x$, see (11) and (12). We then obtain that $t \mapsto \Gamma_t(u)$ is differentiable and derive a dynamic version of Bochner's inequality

$$\frac{1}{2}\Delta_t(\Gamma_t(u)) - \Gamma_t(u, \Delta_t u) \geq \frac{1}{2}(\partial_t\Gamma_t)(u).$$

In contrast to [14], where also a dynamic version of Bochner's inequality has been derived, the function u does not need to arise as a heat flow $P_{t,s}u_s$.

*Institut für Angewandte Mathematik, Universität Bonn, Endenicher Allee 60, 53115 Bonn, Germany (eva.kopfer@iam.uni-bonn.de)

Theorem 1.1. *Let $(X, d_t, m_t)_{t\in I}$ be a one-parameter family of geodesic Polish metric measure spaces satisfying* (4), (5), (11) *and* (12) *such that each (X, d_t, m_t) is a RCD(K, N) space. If the transport estimate* (1) *holds, then the dynamic Bochner inequality* (14) *holds at all $t \in I$.*

Having established a dynamic version of Bochner's inequality we can follow the arguments in [19] and obtain the improved gradient estimate.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $(X, d_t, m_t)_{t\in I}$ be as in Theorem 1.1. Then, if the dynamic Bochner inequality* (14) *and the regularity assumption* (26) *is satisfied, for every $\alpha \in [1/2, 1]$ we have for a.e. $\tau \leq t$ and $\sigma \geq s$*

$$\Gamma_\tau(P_{\tau,\sigma}u)^\alpha \leq P_{\tau,\sigma}(\Gamma_\sigma(u)^\alpha), \tag{2}$$

for every $u \in Dom(\mathcal{E})$ and m-a.e. $x \in X$.

As a consequence we obtain that if (X, d_t, m_t) is a super-Ricci flow in the sense of [22], then for $\beta \in [1, 2]$

$$|\nabla_t P_{t,s}u|_*^\beta \leq P_{t,s}(|\nabla_s u|_*^\beta)$$

and for $p \in [1, \infty]$

$$W_{p,s}(\hat{P}_{t,s}\mu, \hat{P}_{t,s}\nu) \leq W_{p,t}(\mu, \nu), \tag{3}$$

see Corollary 3.2. Similar as in [21] we will apply these results to Brownian motions and construct a coupling (X_s^1, X_s^2) of Brownian motions such that almost surely

$$d_s(X_s^1, X_s^2) \leq d_t(x, y),$$

see Theorem 3.10.

A similar result as in Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 has been derived in [13] in the case of smooth Riemannian manifolds evolving as a super-Ricci flow. They give a characterization of super-Ricci flows in terms of a gradient estimate as in Theorem 1.2 with $\alpha = 1$ and $\alpha = 1/2$ and in terms of a Bochner's formula.

Arnaudon, Coulibaly and Thalmeier [4] showed existence of Brownian motions on a smooth time-dependent setting and apply their results to Ricci flows. Kuwada and Philipowski [16] construct couplings of Brownain motions such that the normalized Perelman's $\mathcal{L}$-distance of the coupling is a supermartingale, see also [23]. This construction is obtained on smooth Riemannian manifolds evolving as a super-Ricci flow.

Example. *A possible example for the setting chosen in this paper is the super-Ricci flow on the spherical cone over the product of the 2-spheres with radius $1/\sqrt{3}$ constructed in [14]. This space is a RCD$^*(4, 5)$-space, and the punctured cone is a 5-dimensional (non-complete) Riemannian manifold with constant curvature 4. A possible Ricci flow on the punctured cone is given by distances which shrink to one point homothetically in time. The completion of this flow is a super-Ricci flow which shrinks to a point homothetically in time. Hence, for time points smaller than the collapsing time the metrics satisfy the assumptions* (11) *and* (12)*. The same argumentation can be used to obtain* (4) *for the measures.*

2 Proof of the main results

In the sequel let $(X, d_t, m_t)_{t\in I}$, where $I = (0, T)$, be a one-parameter family of geodesic Polish metric measure spaces such that the following holds:

1. There exists a finite reference measure m with full topological support such that $m_t = e^{-f_t}$ with Borel functions (f_t) satisfying

$$|f_t(x)| \le C, \quad |f_t(x) - f_t(y)| \le C d_t(x, y), \quad |f_t(x) - f_s(x)| \le L|t - s|, \tag{4}$$

   with constants $C, L > 0$ independent of $x, y \in X$ and $s, t \in I$.

2. the distance is "log-Lipschitz" continuous, i.e.

$$|\log(d_t(x, y)/d_s(x, y))| \le L|t - s| \tag{5}$$

   for all $x, y \in X$ and all $s, t \in I$,

3. there exist constants $K, N \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for each $t \in I$ the space (X, d_t, m_t) satisfies the Riemannian curvature-dimension bound $\mathrm{RCD}(K, N)$ in the sense of [3], [11].

In the sequel let us introduce the time-dependent quantities which we are going to use.

Let $\mathcal{P}(X)$ denote the space of all Borel probability measures. We set for each $p \in [1, \infty)$

$$W_{p,t}(\mu_1, \mu_2) = \min\left\{\int_{X\times X} d_t^p(x, y)\, d\gamma(x, y) | \gamma \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)\right\}^{1/p},$$

where $\Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)$ is the space of all measures in $\mathcal{P}(X \times X)$ whose marginals $(e_i)_{\#}\mu$ coincide with μ_i. We also set

$$W_{\infty,t}(\mu_1, \mu_2) = \inf\left\{||d_t||_{L^\infty(\gamma)} | \gamma \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)\right\} = \lim_{p\to\infty} W_{p,t}(\mu_1, \mu_2),$$

with essential supremum $||d||_{L^\infty(\gamma)} = \inf\{C \ge 0 | d(x, y) \le C\ \gamma\text{-a.e. } x, y\}$. For the second equality see e.g. Lemma 3.2 in [15].

We recall that the Cheeger energy Ch_t at time $t \in I$ is defined as the convex and lower-semicontinuous functional in $L^2(X, m_t)$

$$\mathrm{Ch}_t(u) := \inf\left\{\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{2}\int_X \mathrm{lip}_t(u_n)^2\, dm_t\right\}$$

where the infimum is taken over all bounded Lipschitz functions $u_n \in \mathrm{Lip}_b(X)$ such that $u_n \to u$ in $L^2(X, m_t)$ (cf. [1, 22]). Here, $\mathrm{lip}_t u$ denotes the local Lipschitz constant w.r.t. the metric d_t

$$\mathrm{lip}_t u(x) := \limsup_{y\to x} \frac{|u(y) - u(x)|}{d_t(x, y)},$$

and Ch_t admits the local representation formula

$$\mathrm{Ch}_t(u) = \frac{1}{2}\int_X |\nabla_t u|_*^2\, dm_t,$$

where $|\nabla_t u|_*$ is the minimal relaxed gradient [1]. Since (X, d_t, m_t) satisfies a Riemannian curvature bound, (in particular Ch_t is quadratic) $\mathcal{E}_t := 2\mathrm{Ch}_t$ is a strongly local Dirichlet form with Carré du Champ

$$\Gamma_t(u) = |\nabla_t u|_*^2$$

cf. [19, 3, 2], i.e.

$$\mathcal{E}_t(u) = \int_X \Gamma_t(u)\, dm_t. \tag{6}$$

Thanks to (6), $\mathcal{E}(u,v) = \int_X \Gamma_t(u,v)\, dm_t$ where

$$\Gamma_t(u,v) := \frac{1}{4}(\Gamma_t(u+v) - \Gamma_t(u-v)).$$

$\Gamma(\cdot,\cdot)$ satisfies the chain rule and the Leibniz rule

$$\Gamma_t(\theta(u), v) = \theta'(u)\Gamma_t(u,v), \quad \Gamma_t(uv, w) = u\Gamma_t(v,w) + v\Gamma_t(u,w),$$

where $u, v, w \in Dom(\mathcal{E}_t)$ and $\theta \in \mathrm{Lip}(\mathbb{R})$, $\theta(0) = 0$. We call the linear generator Δ_t the Laplacian and

$$-\int_X \Delta_t u\, v\, dm_t = \mathcal{E}_t(u,v) \qquad \forall u \in Dom(\Delta_t), v \in Dom(\mathcal{E}_t),$$

with domain $Dom(\Delta_t) \subset Dom(\mathcal{E}_t)$.

Due to our assumptions (4) and (5), the sets $L^2(X, m_t)$ and $W^{1,2}(X, d_t, m_t) := \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{E}_t)$ do not depend on t and the respective norms for varying t are equivalent to each other. We put $\mathcal{H} = L^2(X, m)$ and $\mathcal{F} = Dom(\mathcal{E}_{t_0})$ for some fixed t_0 as well as

$$\mathcal{F}_{(s,\tau)} = L^2\big((s,\tau) \to \mathcal{F}\big) \cap H^1\big((s,\tau) \to \mathcal{F}^*\big) \subset \mathcal{C}\big([s,\tau] \to \mathcal{H}\big)$$

for each $0 \le s < \tau \le T$.

The heat equations

A function u is called *solution to the heat equation*

$$\Delta_t u = \partial_t u \qquad \text{on } (s,\tau) \times X$$

if $u \in \mathcal{F}_{(s,\tau)}$ and if for all $w \in \mathcal{F}_{(s,\tau)}$

$$-\int_s^\tau \mathcal{E}_t(u_t, w_t) dt = \int_s^\tau \langle \partial_t u_t, w_t e^{-f_t} \rangle_{\mathcal{F}^*,\mathcal{F}}\, dt \tag{7}$$

where $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{\mathcal{F}^*,\mathcal{F}} = \langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ denotes the dual pairing. Note that thanks to (4), $w \in L^2\big((s,\tau) \to \mathcal{F}\big)$ if and only if $we^{-f} \in L^2\big((s,\tau) \to \mathcal{F}\big)$.

Further a function v is called *solution to the adjoint heat equation*

$$-\Delta_s v + \partial_s f \cdot v = \partial_s v \qquad \text{on } (\sigma,t) \times X$$

if $v \in \mathcal{F}_{(\sigma,t)}$ and if for all $w \in \mathcal{F}_{(\sigma,t)}$

$$\int_\sigma^t \mathcal{E}_s(v_s, w_s) ds + \int_\sigma^t \int_X v_s \cdot w_s \cdot \partial_s f_s\, dm_s\, ds = \int_\sigma^t \langle \partial_s v_s, w_s e^{-f_s} \rangle_{\mathcal{F}^*,\mathcal{F}}\, ds.$$

We recall the following results from [14].

Theorem 2.1. *(i) For each $0 \le s < \tau \le T$ and each $h \in \mathcal{H}$ there exists a unique solution $u \in \mathcal{F}_{(s,\tau)}$ to the heat equation $\partial_t u_t = \Delta_t u_t$ on $(s,\tau) \times X$ with $u_s = h$.*

(ii) The heat propagator $P_{t,s} : h \mapsto u_t$ admits a kernel $p_{t,s}(x,y)$ w.r.t. m_s, i.e.

$$P_{t,s}h(x) = \int p_{t,s}(x,y)h(y)\, dm_s(y). \tag{8}$$

If X is bounded, for each $(s',y) \in (s,T) \times X$ the function $(t,x) \mapsto p_{t,s}(x,y)$ is a solution to the heat equation on $(s',T) \times X$.

(iii) All solutions $u : (t,x) \mapsto u_t(x)$ to the heat equation on $(s,\tau) \times X$ are Hölder continuous in t and x. All nonnegative solutions satisfy a scale invariant parabolic Harnack inequality of Moser type.

(iv) The heat kernel $p_{t,s}(x,y)$ is Hölder continuous in all variables, it is Markovian

$$\int p_{t,s}(x,dy) := \int p_{t,s}(x,y)\, dm_s(y) = 1 \qquad (\forall s < t, \forall x)$$

and has the propagator property

$$p_{t,r}(x,z) = \int p_{t,s}(x,y)\, p_{s,r}(y,z)\, dm_s(y) \qquad (\forall r < s < t, \forall s, z).$$

Theorem 2.2. *(i) For each $0 \le \sigma < t \le T$ and each $g \in \mathcal{H}$ there exists a unique solution $v \in \mathcal{F}_{(0,t)}$ to the adjoint heat equation $\partial_s v_s = -\Delta_s v_s + (\partial_s f_s)v_s$ on $(\sigma,t) \times X$ with $v_t = g$.*

(ii) This solution is given as $v_s(y) = P^*_{t,s}g(y)$ in term of the adjoint heat propagator

$$P^*_{t,s}g(y) = \int p_{t,s}(x,y)g(x)\, dm_t(x). \tag{9}$$

If X is bounded, for each $(t',x) \in (0,t) \times X$ the function $(s,y) \mapsto p_{t,s}(x,y)$ is a solution to the adjoint heat equation on $(0,t') \times X$.

(iii) All solutions $v : (s,y) \mapsto v_s(y)$ to the adjoint heat equation on $(\sigma,t) \times X$ are Hölder continuous in s and y. All nonnegative solutions satisfy a scale invariant parabolic Harnack inequality of Moser type.

By duality, the propagator $(P_{t,s})_{s \le t}$ acting on bounded continuous functions induces a *dual propagator* $(\hat{P}_{t,s})_{s \le t}$ acting on probability measures as follows

$$\int u\, d(\hat{P}_{t,s}\mu) = \int (P_{t,s}u) d\mu \qquad \forall u \in \mathcal{C}_b(X), \forall \mu \in \mathcal{P}(X).$$

The time-dependent function $v_t(x) = P_{t,s}u(x)$ is a solution to the heat equation, whereas the time-dependent measure $\nu_s(dy) = \hat{P}_{t,s}\mu(dy)$ is a solution to the *dual heat equation*

$$-\partial_s \nu = \hat{\Delta}_s \nu.$$

Again $\hat{\Delta}_s$ is defined by duality: $\int u\, d(\hat{\Delta}_s \mu) = \int \Delta_s u\, d\mu \quad \forall u, \forall \mu$.

Lemma 2.3 (Lemma 3.8 in [14])**.** *Let $u, g \in \mathcal{F}$ and $t \in I$ with $g \in L^1(X, m_t)$. Then,*

$$\lim_{h \searrow 0} \frac{1}{h} \left(\int u g dm_t - \int u P^*_{t,t-h} g dm_{t-h} \right) = \int \Gamma_t(u,g) dm_t.$$

Theorem 2.4 (Theorem 2.12 in [14]). *For all $0 < s < \tau < T$ and for all solutions $u \in \mathcal{F}_{(s,T)}$ to the heat equation*

(i) $u_t \in Dom(\Delta_t)$ *for a.e.* $t \in (s,\tau)$.

(ii) If the initial condition $u_s \in \mathcal{F}$ *then*

$$u \in L^2\big((s,\tau) \to Dom(A.)\big) \cap H^1\big((s,\tau) \to \mathcal{H}\big).$$

More precisely,

$$e^{-3L\tau}\mathcal{E}_\tau(u_\tau) + 2\int_s^\tau e^{-3Lt}\int_X \big|\Delta_t u_t\big|^2\, dm_t\, dt \le e^{-3Ls}\cdot\mathcal{E}_s(u_s). \tag{10}$$

(iii) For all solutions v to the adjoint heat equation on $(\sigma,t)\times X$ and all $s \in (\sigma,t)$

$$\mathcal{E}_s(v_s) + \|v_s\|^2_{L^2(m_s)} \le e^{3L(t-s)}\cdot\Big[\mathcal{E}_t(v_t) + \|v_t\|^2_{L^2(m_t)}\Big].$$

Moreover, $v_s \in Dom(\Delta_s)$ *for a.e.* $s \in (\sigma,t)$.

2.1 From transport estimates to Bochner's inequality

In this section we aggravate the regularity of the map $r \mapsto \log d_r(x,y)$. We assume that there exists a $\mathcal{C}^0$ map $r \mapsto h_r(x,y)$, uniformly bounded $|h_r(x,y)| \le C$ such that for each $s,t \in I$ and $x,y \in X$

$$d_t(x,y) = d_s(x,y)e^{\int_s^t h_r(x,y)\,dr}. \tag{11}$$

Consequently, for each $x,y \in X$, $r \mapsto \log d_r(x,y)$ is continuously differentiable with derivative $h_r(x,y) = \frac{d}{dr}\log d_r(x,y)$.
Moreover we assume that

$$\begin{aligned}&\forall x \in X, r \in I \text{ the limit } \lim_{y\to x} h_r(x,y) := H_r(x) \text{ exists, measurable in } x,\\ &\text{and } r \mapsto H_r(x) \text{ is continuous } \forall x \in X.\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

We obtain the following lemma.

Lemma 2.5. *Let $u \in \mathrm{Lip}(X)$. Then for all $s,t \in I$ and $x \in X$*

$$\mathrm{lip}_t u(x) = \mathrm{lip}_s u(x) e^{-\int_s^t H_r(x)\,dr}.$$

Proof. For $s < t$, we obtain from the very definition of the local slope

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{lip}_t u(x) =& \limsup_{y\to x}\frac{|u(y)-u(x)|}{d_t(x,y)} \le \limsup_{y\to x}\frac{|u(y)-u(x)|}{d_s(x,y)} e^{-\liminf_{y\to x}\int_s^t h_r(x,y)\,dr}\\ =& \mathrm{lip}_s u(x) e^{-\int_s^t H_r(x)\,dr},\end{aligned}$$

where we applied dominated convergence. Changing the roles of s and t yields

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{lip}_s u(x) =& \limsup_{y\to x}\frac{|u(y)-u(x)|}{d_s(x,y)} \le \limsup_{y\to x}\frac{|u(y)-u(x)|}{d_t(x,y)} e^{-\liminf_{y\to x}\int_s^t h_r(x,y)\,dr}\\ =& \mathrm{lip}_t u(x) e^{-\int_s^t H_r(x)\,dr},\end{aligned}$$

which proves the assertion. □

We apply our observation to the minimal relaxed gradient. We say that $G \in L^2(X, m_t)$ is a *t-relaxed gradient* of $u \in L^2(X, m_t)$ if there exists Lipschitz functions $u_n \in L^2(X, m_t)$ such that

$$u_n \to u \text{ in } L^2(X, m_t) \text{ and } \mathrm{lip}_t u_n \rightharpoonup \tilde{G} \text{ in } L^2(X, m_t),\ \tilde{G} \leq G\, m\text{-a.e. in } X.$$

G is the *minimal t-relaxed gradient* $|\nabla_t u|_*$ if its $L^2(X, m_t)$ norm is minimal among all relaxed gradients, see [1, Definition 4.2]. The collection of all t-relaxed gradients is convex and closed in $L^2(X, m_t)$ [1, Lemma 4.3].

Proposition 2.6. *For m-a.e. $x \in X$*

$$|\nabla_t u|_*(x) = |\nabla_s u|_*(x) e^{-\int_s^t H_r(x)\, dr}$$

for each $u \in \mathcal{F}$ and for all $s, t \in I$. In particular for m-a.e. $x \in X$, $t \mapsto |\nabla_t u|_*(x)$ is continuously differentiable.

Proof. Assume $s \leq t$. Let $u_n \in L^2(X, m_s)$ be a sequence of Borel Lipschitz functions such that $u_n \to u$ and $\mathrm{lip}_s u_n \to |\nabla_s u|_*$ in $L^2(X, m_s)$, see Lemma 4.3 in [1]. Then since H is uniformly bounded

$$\mathrm{lip}_s u_n(\cdot) e^{-\int_s^t H_r(\cdot)\, dr} \to |\nabla_s u|_*(\cdot) e^{-\int_s^t H_r(\cdot)\, dr} \text{ in } L^2(X, m_s).$$

This implies that $|\nabla_s u|_*(\cdot) e^{-\int_s^t H_r(\cdot)\, dr}$ is a relaxed gradient of u with respect to the d_t norm, and hence from Lemma 4.4 in [1]

$$|\nabla_t u|_*(\cdot) \leq |\nabla_s u|_*(\cdot) e^{-\int_s^t H_r(\cdot)\, dr} \quad m\text{- a.e. in } X.$$

Changing the roles of s and t yields that

$$|\nabla_t u|_*(\cdot) = |\nabla_s u|_*(\cdot) e^{-\int_s^t H_r(\cdot)\, dr} \quad m\text{- a.e. in } X.$$

Choosing s and t from a dense and countable set D in I the argument from above implies that m-a.e. in X

$$|\nabla_t u|_*(\cdot) = |\nabla_s u|_*(\cdot) e^{-\int_s^t H_r(\cdot)\, dr} \tag{13}$$

for each s and t in D. Since the dependence of the left and the right side of the equality is continuous with respect to s and t, we conclude that for m-a.e. $x \in X$, $|\nabla_t u|_*(\cdot) = |\nabla_s u|_*(\cdot) e^{-\int_s^t H_r(\cdot)\, dr}$ holds for every s and t in I.

Similarly, we choose u in a dense and countable set C in $\mathcal{F}$ ([2, Proposition 4.10]) and obtain that m-a.e. equation (13) holds for every $s, t \in I$ and every $u \in C$. Given $u \in \mathcal{F}$ we approximate u by a sequence $u_n \in C$, i.e. $|\nabla_t u_n| \to |\nabla_t u|$ in $L^2(X, m_t)$. Then there exists a subsequence u_{n_k} such that for m-a.e. $x \in X$, $|\nabla_t u_{n_k}|(x) \to |\nabla_t u|(x)$. Equality (13) implies that for the same subsequence $|\nabla_s u_{n_k}|(x) \to |\nabla_s u|(x)$ for m-a.e. x. Hence we showed that for m-a.e. $x \in X$, (13) holds for every $u \in \mathcal{F}$ and every $s, t \in I$.

The last assertion follows directly from the fact that $r \mapsto H_r(x)$ is supposed to be continuous for all $x \in X$. □

Following [14] we give a weak dynamic version of Bochner's inequality.

Definition 2.7. *We say that the dynamic Bochner inequality holds at time t if for all $u \in Dom(\Delta_t) \cap L^\infty(X, m_t)$ such that $\Gamma_t(u) \in L^\infty(X, m_t)$, and all $g \in Dom(\Delta_t) \cap L^\infty(X, m_t)$ with $g \geq 0$*

$$\frac{1}{2}\int \Gamma_t(u)\Delta_t g \, dm_t + \int (\Delta_t u)^2 g + \Gamma_t(u, g)\Delta_t u \, dm_t \geq \frac{1}{2}\int (\partial_t \Gamma_t)(u) g \, dm_t. \tag{14}$$

This is a "real" Bochner's inequality in the sense that on the one hand u and g do not have to arise as a heat flow (see [14, Definition 5.5]), and on the other we employ the time-derivative $\partial_t \Gamma_t(u)$ in contrast to [14, Definition 5.5, Definition 5.6]). For the proof of Theorem 1.1 we follow the argumentation in the proof of Theorem 5.13 in [14]. The argumentation in [14] is inspired by [9], where the authors prove the equivalence between Wasserstein contraction estimates and Bochner's inequality in the static setting.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Define $u = h^t_\varepsilon u_0$, where $u_0 \in L^\infty(X, m_t) \cap L^2(X, m_t)$ and h^t_ε the static semigroup mollification

$$h^t_\varepsilon u_0 := -\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}\int_0^\infty H^t_r u_0 \kappa(\frac{r}{\varepsilon}) \, dr.$$

Here, $(H^t_r)_{r\geq 0}$ denotes the (static) semigroup associated to $\mathcal{E}_t$ and $\kappa \in \mathcal{C}^\infty_c((0,\infty))$ with $\kappa \geq 0$ and $\int_0^\infty \kappa_r \, dr = 1$. Recall that $u, \Delta_t u \in Dom(\Delta_t) \cap \mathrm{Lip}_b(X)$.

Let $g \in \mathcal{F} \cap L^\infty(X, m_t)$ such that $g \geq 0$. Then, the transport estimate (1) together with Lemma 5.10 and Lemma 5.11 in [14] eventually yields

$$-\frac{1}{2}\int P_{t,s}(\Gamma_s(u)) g dm_t + \int \Gamma_t(P_{t,s}u, u) g dm_t \leq \frac{1}{2}\int \Gamma_t(u) g dm_t,$$

see [14, Section 5]. Then following the lines in [14], we subtract $\frac{1}{2}\int \Gamma_t(u) g dm_t$ on each side and divide by $t - s$ obtaining

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2(t-s)}\left[\int \Gamma_t(u) g dm_\tau - \int P_{t,s}(\Gamma_s(u)) g dm_t\right] \\ &+ \frac{1}{t-s}\left[\int \Gamma_t(P_{t,s}u, u) g dm_t - \int \Gamma_t(u) g dm_t\right] \\ &\leq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

We decompose the first term on the left-hand side into the following two terms

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2(t-s)}\left[\int \Gamma_t(u) g dm_t - \int \Gamma_s(u) P^*_{t,s} g dm_s\right] \\ =&\frac{1}{2(t-s)}\left[\int \Gamma_t(u) g dm_t - \int \Gamma_t(u) P^*_{t,s} g dm_s\right] + \frac{1}{2}\int \frac{\Gamma_t(u) - \Gamma_s(u)}{t-s} P^*_{t,s} g dm_s. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $\Gamma_t(u) \in \mathcal{F}$ [19, Lemma 3.2] and thus we can apply Lemma 2.3, which gives us

$$\lim_{s \nearrow t} \frac{1}{(t-s)}\left[\int \Gamma_t(u) g dm_t - \int \Gamma_t(u) P^*_{t,s} g dm_s\right] = \int \Gamma_t(\Gamma_t(u), g) dm_t, \tag{16}$$

while, since $|\frac{\Gamma_s(u)-\Gamma_t(u)}{(t-s)}| \leq 2L\Gamma_t(u) \in L^\infty(X,m_t)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\liminf_{s\nearrow t} \int \frac{\Gamma_t(u)-\Gamma_s(u)}{(t-s)}(P^*_{t,s}g)dm_s \\
&\geq \liminf_{s\nearrow t} \int \frac{\Gamma_t(u)-\Gamma_s(u)}{(t-s)}gdm_t + \liminf_{s\nearrow t} \int \frac{\Gamma_t(u)-\Gamma_s(u)}{(t-s)}(P^*_{t,s}ge^{-f_s} - ge^{-f_t})dm \\
&\geq \int (\partial_t\Gamma_t)(u)gdm_t - \limsup_{s\nearrow t} 2L||\Gamma_t(u)||_{L^\infty(X,m_t)}||P^*_{t,s}ge^{-f_s} - ge^{-f_t}||_{L^1(X,m_t)} \\
&= \int (\partial_t\Gamma_t)(u)gdm_t,
\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where we used Proposition 2.6 in the last inequality and that $P^*_{t,s}ge^{-f_s} \to ge^{-f_t}$ in $L^1(X,m)$ as $s \to t$.

Regarding the second term on the left-hand side of (15), note that the Leibniz rule and the integration by parts formula is applicable and we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\int \Gamma_t(P_{t,s}u,u)gdm_t &= \int \Gamma_t(gP_{t,s}u,u)dm_t - \int \Gamma_t(g,u)P_{t,s}udm_t \\
&= -\int \psi P^*_{t,s}(g\Delta_t u)dm_s - \int P^*_{t,s}(\Gamma_t(g,u))udm_s.
\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

Subtracting $\int \Gamma_t(u)gdm_t$ and applying (18)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{(t-s)}(\int \Gamma_t(P_{t,s}u,u)gdm_t - \int \Gamma_t(u)gdm_t) \\
=&\frac{1}{(t-s)}(-\int \psi P^*_{t,s}(g\Delta_t u)dm_s + \int \psi(g\Delta_t u)dm_t) \\
+&\frac{1}{(t-s)}(-\int P^*_{t,s}(\Gamma_t(g,u))udm_s + \int \Gamma_t(u,g)udm_t).
\end{aligned}$$

Letting $s \nearrow t$ we have since $g \in \mathcal{F} \cap L^\infty(X,m_t)$ and $\Delta_t u \in \mathrm{Lip}_b(X)$, $g\Delta_t u \in \mathcal{F} \cap L^1(X,m_t)$

$$\lim_{s\nearrow t} \frac{1}{(t-s)}(-\int uP^*_{t,s}(g\Delta_t u)dm_s + \int u(g\Delta_t u)dm_t) = \int \Gamma_t(u,g\Delta_t u)dm_t$$

by virtue of Lemma 2.3. In order to determine

$$\lim_{s\nearrow t} \frac{1}{(t-s)}(-\int P^*_{t,s}(\Gamma_t(g,u))udm_s + \int \Gamma_t(u,g)udm_t),$$

we need to argue whether $\Gamma_t(g,u) \in \mathcal{F}$. But this is the case, since, due to our static RCD(K,∞) assumption, we may apply Theorem 3.4 in [19] and obtain

$$\Gamma_t(\Gamma_t(g,u)) \leq 2(\gamma_2(u) - K\Gamma_t(u))\Gamma_t(g) + 2(\gamma_2(g) - K\Gamma_t(g))\Gamma_\tau(u) \quad m_t\text{-a.e.},$$

where $\gamma_2(u), \gamma_2(g) \in L^1(X,m_t)$. Our regularity assumptions on u and g provide that the right hand side is in $L^1(X,m_t)$ and consequently Lemma 2.3 implies

$$\lim_{s\nearrow t} \frac{1}{(t-s)}(-\int P^*_{t,s}(\Gamma_t(g,u))udm_s + \int \Gamma_t(u,g)udm_t) = \int \Gamma_t(\Gamma_t(g,u),u)dm_t.$$

Combining these observations we find

$$\lim_{s\nearrow t}\frac{1}{(t-s)}(\int\Gamma_t(P_{t,s}u,u)gdm_t-\int\Gamma_t(u)gdm_t)$$
$$=\int\Gamma_t(u,g\Delta_t u)dm_t+\int\Gamma_t(\Gamma_t(g,u),u)dm_t=-\int(\Delta_t u)^2g+\Gamma_t(g,u)\Delta_t udm_t. \tag{19}$$

Hence from (15), (16), (17) and (19)

$$\frac{1}{2}\int(\partial_t\Gamma_t)(u)gdm_t+\frac{1}{2}\int\Gamma_t(\Gamma_t(u),g)dm_t\leq\int(\Delta_t u)^2g+\Gamma_t(g,u)\Delta_t udm_t.$$

Let now $g\in Dom(\Delta_t)\cap L^\infty(X,m)$ with $g\geq 0$ and $u\in Dom(\Delta_t)\cap L^\infty(X,m_t)$ with $\Gamma_t u\in L^\infty(X,m_t)$. Then from the above argumentation we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2}\int\Gamma_t(h^t_\varepsilon u)\Delta_t g\,dm_t+\int(\Delta_t(h^t_\varepsilon u))^2g+\Gamma_t(g,h^t_\varepsilon u)\Delta_t(h^t_\varepsilon u)dm_t$$
$$\geq\frac{1}{2}\int(\partial_t\Gamma_t)(h^t_\varepsilon u_n)gdm_t.$$

Since $(\partial_t\Gamma_t)(u)(x)=-2H_t(x)\Gamma_t(u)(x)$ for m-a.e. $x\in X$ and $|H_t(x)|\leq C$, we obtain the assertion by letting $\varepsilon\to 0$ with taking into account that

$$||h^t_\varepsilon u-u||_{\mathcal{F}}\to 0 \text{ as } \varepsilon\to 0 \text{ and } \Delta_t h^t_\varepsilon u=h^t_\varepsilon\Delta_t u.$$

□

2.2 Self-improvement of the gradient estimate

Quasi-regular Dirichlet forms

We follow the approach in [19] and briefly recall the notion of quasi-regular Dirichlet forms developed in [18] and [10]. We denote by $\mathcal{F}=\{u\in L^2(X,m)|\mathcal{E}(u)<\infty\}$ the domain of a Dirichlet form $\mathcal{E}\colon L^2(X,m)\to[0,\infty]$, where X is a Polish space and m is a σ-finite Borel measure. $\mathcal{F}$ is a Hilbert space with norm $||u||^2_{\mathcal{F}}=||u||^2_{L^2(X,m)}+\mathcal{E}(u)$. If F is a closed set in X we denote

$$\mathcal{F}_F:=\{u\in\mathcal{F}|u(x)=0 \text{ for } m\text{-a.e. } x\in X\setminus F\}.$$

Definition 2.8. *Given a Dirichlet form $\mathcal{E}$ on a Polish space X, an $\mathcal{E}$-nest is an increasing sequence of closed subsets $(F_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}\subset X$ such that $\cup_{k\in\mathbb{N}}\mathcal{F}_{F_k}$ is dense in $\mathcal{F}$.*
A set $N\subset X$ is $\mathcal{E}$-polar if there is an $\mathcal{E}$-nest $(F_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that $N\subset X\setminus\cup_{k\in\mathbb{N}}F_k$.
If a property holds in a complement of an $\mathcal{E}$-polar set we say that it holds $\mathcal{E}$-quasi-everywhere ($\mathcal{E}$-q.e.).
A function $u\colon X\to\mathbb{R}$ is said to be $\mathcal{E}$-quasi-continuous if there exists an $\mathcal{E}$-nest $(F_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that every restriction $f_{|F_k}$ is continuous on F_k.

The Dirichlet form $\mathcal{E}$ is said to be quasi-regular if the following three properties hold.

1. *There exists an $\mathcal{E}$-nest $(F_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ consisting of compact sets.*

2. *There exists a dense subset of $\mathcal{F}$ whose elements have $\mathcal{E}$-quasi-continuous representatives.*

3. *There exists an $\mathcal{E}$-polar set $N \subset X$ and a countable collection of $\mathcal{E}$-quasi-continuous functions $(f_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{F}$ separating the points of $X \setminus N$.*

For every $u \in \mathcal{F}$ the quasi-regularity implies that u admits an $\mathcal{E}$-quasi-continuous representative $\tilde{u}$. The representative is unique *q.e.* and

$$\text{if } u \in \mathcal{F} \text{ with } |u| \leq C \, m\text{-a.e., then } |\tilde{u}| \leq C \text{ q.e..} \tag{20}$$

The following Lemma is taken from [19, Lemma 2.6].

Lemma 2.9. *Let $\mathcal{E}$ be a strongly local, quasi-regular Dirichlet form with linear generator Δ. Let $\psi \in L^1(X,m) \cap L^\infty(X,m)$ nonnegative and $\varphi \in L^1(X,m) \cap L^2(X,m)$ such that*

$$\int_X \psi \Delta g \, dm \geq -\int_X \varphi g \, dm$$

for any nonnegative $g \in \mathcal{F} \cap L^\infty(X,m)$ with $\Delta g \in L^\infty(X,m)$. Then $\psi \in \mathcal{F}$ with

$$\mathcal{E}(\psi) \leq \int_X \psi\varphi \, dm, \quad \int \varphi \, dm \geq 0,$$

and there exists a unique finite Borel measure $\mu := \mu_+ - \varphi m$ with $\mu_+ \geq 0$, $\mu_+(X) \leq \int \varphi \, dm$ such that every $\mathcal{E}$-polar set is $|\mu|$-negligible, the q.c. representative of any function in $\mathcal{F}$ belongs to $L^1(X,|\mu|)$ and

$$-\mathcal{E}(\psi, g) = -\int \Gamma(\psi, g) \, dm = \int \tilde{g} \, d\mu \text{ for every } g \in \mathcal{F}.$$

We denote by $\Delta^* u$ the measured valued Laplacian, i.e. the signed measure $\mu = \mu_+ - \mu_-$ such that

$$\mathcal{E}(u, \varphi) = \int \tilde{\varphi} \, d\mu \text{ for every } \varphi \in \mathcal{F}. \tag{21}$$

Contraction estimates for the heat flows $P_{t,s}$ and $\hat{P}_{t,s}$

For each $t \in I$ we define the Hessian

$$H_t[u](g,h) := \frac{1}{2}\Big(\Gamma_t(g, \Gamma_t(u,h)) + \Gamma_t(h, \Gamma_t(u,g)) - \Gamma_t(u, \Gamma_t(g,h))\Big).$$

Recall that on a family of closed Riemannian manifolds (M, g_t) we obtain the equality

$$H_t[u](g,h) = \langle \nabla_t^2 u \nabla_t g, \nabla_t h \rangle_{g_t}.$$

Further note that $|\langle \nabla_t^2 u \nabla_t g, \nabla_t h \rangle_{g_t}| \leq |\nabla_t^2 u|_{HS} |\nabla_t g| |\nabla_t h|$, where $|\cdot|_{HS}$ denotes the Hilbert-Schmidt norm. If the manifold has Ricci curvature bounded from below by some $K \in \mathbb{R}$ then with $||\cdot||_2 = ||\cdot||_{L^2}$ and $K_- = \max\{-K, 0\}$

$$|||\nabla_t^2 u|_{HS}||_2^2 \leq (1 + K_-/2)(||\Delta_t u||_2^2 + ||u||_2^2).$$

We define the distribution valued Γ_2-operator

$$\Gamma_{2,t}(u) \colon \mathcal{F} \cap L^\infty \cap L^1 \to \mathbb{R}$$

as in [14].

Definition 2.10. *For each $u \in Dom(\Delta_t)$ such that $u, \Gamma_t(u) \in L^\infty(X, m_t)$ we define*

$$\Gamma_{2,t}(u)(g) = \int -\frac{1}{2}\Gamma_t(\Gamma_t(u), g)\, dm_t + \int (g(\Delta_t u)^2 + \Gamma_t(g, u)\Delta_t u)\, dm_t,$$

where $g \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $g \in L^1(X, m_t) \cap L^\infty(X, m_t)$.

Note that thanks to the static $\mathrm{RCD}(K, N)$-condition the domain of the Laplacian coincides with the domain of the Hessian, i.e. $Dom(\Delta_t) = W^{2,2}(X, d_t, m_t)$, and

$$|\Gamma_{2,t}(u)(g)| \leq ||g||_\infty ||\Delta_t u||_2^2 + C||\sqrt{\Gamma_t(u)}||_\infty ||\sqrt{\mathcal{E}_t(g)}(||\Delta_t u||_2 + ||u||_2),$$

cf. section 5 in [14]. Moreover, each $\mathcal{E}_t = 2\mathrm{Ch}_t$ defines a quasi-regular Dirichlet form ([19, Theorem 4.1]).

Proposition 2.11. *Suppose that Bochner's inequality holds at time $t \in I$. Then for every $u \in Dom(\Delta_t)$ with $u, \Gamma_t(u) \in L^\infty(X, m_t)$*

1. *$\Gamma_t(u) \in \mathcal{F}$ with*

$$\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{E}_t(\Gamma_t(u)) \leq L||\Gamma_t(u)||_\infty \mathcal{E}_t(u) + ||\Gamma_t(u)||_\infty ||\Delta_t u||_2^2 + C||\Delta_t u||_2 \sqrt{||\Gamma_t(u)^2||_\infty (||\Delta_t u||_2^2 + ||u||_2^2)}.$$

2. *There exists a finite nonnegative Borel measure μ_+ such that every $\mathcal{E}_t$-polar set is μ_+-negligible and for each $g \in \mathcal{F}$ the $\mathcal{E}_t$-q.c. representative $\tilde{g} \in L^1(X, \mu_+)$ with*

$$2\Gamma_{2,t}(u)(g) = \int g(\partial_t \Gamma_t)(u)\, dm_t + \int \tilde{g}\, d\mu_+.$$

In particular $\Gamma_{2,t}(u)$ is a finite Borel measure with

$$2\Gamma_{2,t}(u) = (\partial_t \Gamma_t)(u)m + \mu_+.$$

Proof. Let $u_\varepsilon = h_\varepsilon^t u$. Choosing $\psi = \Gamma_t(u_\varepsilon)$ and $\varphi = -(\partial_t \Gamma_t)(u_\varepsilon) - 2\Gamma_t(u_\varepsilon, \Delta_t u_\varepsilon)$ in Lemma 2.9 and applying Bochner's inequality together with the Leibniz rule yields

$$\mathcal{E}_t(\Gamma_t(u_\varepsilon)) \leq -\int \Gamma_t(u_\varepsilon)((\partial_t \Gamma_t)(u_\varepsilon) + 2\Gamma_t(u_\varepsilon, \Delta_t u_\varepsilon))\, dm_t.$$

Applying the Leibniz rule once again we obtain

$$\mathcal{E}_t(\Gamma_t(u_\varepsilon)) \leq -\int (\Gamma_t(u_\varepsilon)(\partial_t \Gamma_t)(u_\varepsilon) - 2(\Delta_t u_\varepsilon)^2 \Gamma_t(u_\varepsilon) - 2\Gamma_t(u_\varepsilon, \Gamma_t(u_\varepsilon))\Delta_t u_\varepsilon)\, dm_t.$$

Note that as $\varepsilon \to 0$, $\Gamma(u_\varepsilon) \to \Gamma(u)$ pointwise, in L^1 and in the weak* L^∞ topology. The latter is due to the fact that $\Gamma(u_\varepsilon - u)$ is uniformly bounded and converges to 0 in L^1. Moreover by the uniform boundedness of $\Gamma(u_\varepsilon)$ in L^∞ we obtain that $\Gamma(u_\varepsilon) \to \Gamma(u)$ in L^2. Hence we find

$$\mathcal{E}_t(\Gamma_t(u)) \leq \liminf_{\varepsilon \to 0} \mathcal{E}_t(\Gamma_t(u_\varepsilon))$$

and

$$\int \Gamma_t(u)(\partial_t\Gamma_t)(u)\,dm_t = \int \Gamma_t(u)^2 e^{H_t}\,dm_t$$
$$= \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\int \Gamma_t(u_\varepsilon)^2 e^{H_t}\,dm_t = \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\int \Gamma_t(u_\varepsilon)(\partial_t\Gamma_t)(u_\varepsilon)\,dm_t,$$

while

$$\int (\Delta_t u)^2\Gamma_t(u)\,dm_t = \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\int (h^t_\varepsilon\Delta_t u)^2\Gamma_t(u_\varepsilon)\,dm_t = \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\int (\Delta_t u_\varepsilon)^2\Gamma_t(u_\varepsilon)\,dm_t.$$

In order to show that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\int \Gamma_t(u_\varepsilon,\Gamma_t(u_\varepsilon))\Delta_t u_\varepsilon\,dm_t = \int \Gamma_t(u,\Gamma_t(u))\Delta_t u\,dm_t,$$

we show that $\Gamma_t(u_\varepsilon,\Gamma_t(u_\varepsilon))$ weakly converges to $\Gamma_t(u,\Gamma_t(u))$ in L^2. Take a sufficiently smooth testfunction φ ($\varphi\in\mathcal{F}\cap L^\infty$), then we easily deduce

$$\int \Gamma_t(u_\varepsilon,\Gamma_t(u_\varepsilon))\varphi\,dm_t = -\int \Delta_t u_\varepsilon\Gamma_t(u_\varepsilon)\varphi\,dm_t - \int \Gamma_t(u_\varepsilon,\varphi)\Gamma_t(u_\varepsilon)\,dm_t$$
$$\to -\int \Delta_t u\Gamma_t(u)\varphi\,dm_t - \int \Gamma_t(u,\varphi)\Gamma_t(u)\,dm_t$$

by the strong L^2 convergence of $\Delta_t u_\varepsilon$, the weak*-L^∞ convergence of $\Gamma(u_\varepsilon)$ and the L^1 convergence of $\Gamma(u_\varepsilon,\varphi)$. Moreover $||\Gamma_t(u_\varepsilon,\Gamma_t(u_\varepsilon))||_2$ is uniformly bounded in ε since

$$\int |\Gamma_t(u_\varepsilon,\Gamma_t(u_\varepsilon))|^2\,dm_t \le 4||\Gamma_t(u_\varepsilon)^2||_\infty C(||\Delta_t u_\varepsilon||_2^2 + ||u_\varepsilon||_2^2)$$
$$\le C||\Gamma_t(u)^2||_\infty||(||\Delta_t u||_2^2 + ||u||_2^2))$$

since the domain of the Laplacian coincides with the domain of the Hessian, cf. [14, Section 3], [12]. Consequently we obtain that $\Gamma_t(u_\varepsilon,\Gamma_t(u_\varepsilon))$ weakly converges to $\Gamma_t(u,\Gamma_t(u))$ in L^2 since $\mathcal{F}\cap L^\infty$ is dense in L^2 [1, Theorem 4.5].

We conclude

$$\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{E}_t(\Gamma_t(u)) \le -\int \frac{1}{2}\Gamma_t(u)(\partial_t\Gamma_t)(u) - \Gamma_t(u)(\Delta_t u)^2 - \Gamma_t(u,\Gamma_t(u))\Delta_t u\,dm_t$$
$$\le L||\Gamma_t(u)||_\infty\mathcal{E}_t(u) + ||\Gamma_t(u)||_\infty||\Delta_t u||_2^2 + C||\Delta_t u||_2\sqrt{||\Gamma_t(u)^2||_\infty(||\Delta_t u||_2^2 + ||u||_2^2)}.$$

We show the second claim again by using the semigroup mollification $u_\varepsilon := h^t_\varepsilon u$. By Lemma 2.9 we deduce that

$$\int g\,d\Delta_t^*\Gamma_t(u_\varepsilon) - \int \tilde{g}2\Gamma_t(u_\varepsilon,\Delta_t u_\varepsilon)\,dm_t$$
$$= \int \tilde{g}\,d\mu_+(u_\varepsilon) + \int \tilde{g}(\partial_t\Gamma_t)(u_\varepsilon)\,dm_t,$$

where Δ_t^* is the measure valued Laplacian, and $\mu_+(u_\varepsilon)$ the nonnegative Borel measure with $\mu_+(u_\varepsilon)(X) \le \int(\Delta_t u_\varepsilon)^2 + \frac{1}{2}(\partial_t\Gamma_t)(u_\varepsilon)\,dm_t$. Hence, since $g=\tilde{g}$

q.e.

$$\int g\, d\mu_+(u_\varepsilon)$$
$$= \int -\Gamma_t(\Gamma_t(u_\varepsilon), g)\, dm_t + \int 2g(\Delta_t u_\varepsilon)^2 + 2\Gamma_t(g, u_\varepsilon)(\Delta_t u_\varepsilon)\, dm_t - \int g(\partial_t \Gamma_t)(u_\varepsilon)\, dm_t.$$

Note that the right hand side converges as $\varepsilon \to 0$ since $\Gamma(u_\varepsilon) \to \Gamma(u)$ weakly in $\mathcal{F}$. Indeed, take a test function $\varphi \in Dom(\Delta_t)$. Then

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \int \Gamma_t(\Gamma_t(u_\varepsilon), \varphi)\, dm_t = -\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \int \Gamma_t(u_\varepsilon)\Delta_t\varphi\, dm_t = \int \Gamma_t(\Gamma_t(u), \varphi)\, dm_t.$$

Since $\mathcal{E}_t(\Gamma_t(u_\varepsilon))$ is uniformly bounded in ε by the first claim and $Dom(\Delta_t)$ is dense in $\mathcal{F}$ we deduce that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \int \Gamma_t(\Gamma_t(u_\varepsilon), g)\, dm_t = \int \Gamma_t(\Gamma_t(u), g)\, dm_t \qquad \forall\, g \in \mathcal{F}.$$

Define the linear functional $\tilde{\mu}_+(u)\colon \mathcal{F} \cap L^\infty \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\tilde{\mu}_+(u)(g) := \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \int g\, d\mu_+(u_\varepsilon).$$

Note that if $g \geq 0$ we have $\tilde{\mu}_+(u)(g) \geq 0$ by the Bochner inequality. The Hahn-Banach theorem implies that there exists a linear functional $M\colon \mathcal{F} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $M(g) = \mu_+(u)(g)$ for all $g \in \mathcal{F} \cap L^\infty$ and $M(g) \geq 0$ for all $g \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $g \geq 0$ a.e.. Moreover, if $g \in \mathcal{F}$ with $g \leq 1$ m-a.e.

$$M(g) = \mu_+(u)(g) = \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \int g\, d\mu_+(u_\varepsilon) \leq \mu_+(u_\varepsilon)(X) \leq \int (\Delta_t u)^2 + C\Gamma_t(u)\, dm_t.$$

Thus by Proposition 2.5 in [19] there exists a unique finite and nonnegative Borel measure μ_+ in X such that every $\mathcal{E}_t$-polar set is μ_+-negligible and for each $g \in \mathcal{F}$ the $\mathcal{E}_t$-q.c. representative $\tilde{g} \in L^1(X, \mu_+)$ with

$$M(g) = \int \tilde{g}\, d\mu_+.$$

Consequently

$$2\Gamma_{2,t}(u)(g) = \int g(\partial_t\Gamma_t)(u)\, dm_t + \int \tilde{g}\, d\mu_+,$$

and hence $\Gamma_{2,t}$ is measure valued with $2\Gamma_{2,t}(u) = (\partial_t\Gamma_t)(u)\, m_t + \mu_+$. □

By virtue of Lebesgue's decomposition theorem we denote by $\gamma_{2,t}(u) \in L^1(X, m_t)$ the density wrt m_t

$$\Gamma_{2,t}(u) = \gamma_{2,t}(u)m_t + \Gamma_2^\perp(u), \quad \Gamma_2^\perp(u) \perp m_t,$$

and thus by the above Lemma

$$\gamma_{2,t}(u) \geq \frac{1}{2}(\partial_t\Gamma_t)(u) \ m\text{-a.e. and } \Gamma_{2,t}^\perp(u) \geq 0. \tag{22}$$

We define for $u, h \in Dom(\Delta_t)$ such that $\Gamma_t(u), \Gamma_t(h) \in L^\infty(X, m_t)$

$$\Gamma_{2,t}(u,h)(g) := \frac{1}{4}\Gamma_{2,t}(u+h)(g) - \frac{1}{4}\Gamma_{2,t}(u-h)(g),$$

where $g \in \mathcal{F} \cap L^\infty$. Note that the right-hand side is well-defined since the domain of the Laplacian and the Hessian coincide and

$$\Gamma_{2,t}(u,h)(g) = \int -\frac{1}{2}\Gamma_t(g, \Gamma_t(u,h)) + g\Delta_t u \Delta_t h + \frac{1}{2}\Delta_t h \Gamma_t(u,g) + \frac{1}{2}\Delta_t u \Gamma_t(h,g)\, dm_t$$

Similarly,

$$\gamma_{2,t}(u,h) := \frac{1}{4}\gamma_{2,t}(u+h) - \frac{1}{4}\gamma_{2,t}(u-h).$$

The following Lemma is an adaptation of Lemma 3.3 in [19].

Lemma 2.12. *Let $\bar{u} = (u_i)_{i=1}^n$ with $u_i \in Dom(\Delta_t)$ such that $u, \Gamma_t(u) \in L^\infty(X, m_t)$ and let $\Psi \in \mathcal{C}^3(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $\Psi(0) = 0$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_{2,t}(\Psi(\bar{u})) =& \sum_{i,j} \Gamma_{2,t}(u_i, u_j)(\partial_i \Psi)(\bar{u})(\partial_j \Psi)(\bar{u}) \\ &+2\sum_{i,j,k}(\partial_i \Psi)(\bar{u})(\partial_{jk}\Psi)(\bar{u}) H_t[u_i](u_j, u_k)\, m_t \\ &+ \sum_{i,j,k,h}(\partial_{ik}\Psi)(\bar{u})(\partial_{jh}\Psi)(\bar{u})\Gamma_t(u_i,u_j)\Gamma_t(u_k,u_h)\, m_t.\end{aligned}$$

In particular m_t-a.e.

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_{2,t}(\Psi(\bar{u})) =& \sum_{i,j} \gamma_{2,t}(u_i, u_j)(\partial_i \Psi)(\bar{u})(\partial_j \Psi)(\bar{u}) \\ &+2\sum_{i,j,k}(\partial_i \Psi)(\bar{u})(\partial_{jk}\Psi)(\bar{u}) H_t[u_i](u_j, u_k) \\ &+ \sum_{i,j,k,h}(\partial_{ik}\Psi)(\bar{u})(\partial_{jh}\Psi)(\bar{u})\Gamma_t(u_i,u_j)\Gamma_t(u_k,u_h).\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Note that $\Psi(\bar{u}) \in Dom(\Delta_t)$ with $\Gamma_t(u) \in L^\infty$ since

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_t(\Psi(\bar{u})) =& \sum_{i,j} \partial_i \Psi(\bar{u}) \partial_j \Psi(\bar{u}) \Gamma_t(u_i, u_j) \in L^1 \cap L^\infty, \\ \Delta_t(\Psi(\bar{u})) =& \sum_i \partial_i \Psi(\bar{u}) \Delta_t u_i + \sum_{i,j} \partial_{ij}\Psi(\bar{u})\Gamma_t(u_i,u_j) \in L^2.\end{aligned}$$

Thus by definition for each $g \in \mathcal{F} \cap L^\infty$

$$2\Gamma_{2,t}(\Psi(\bar{u}))(g) = \int -\Gamma_t(g, \Gamma_t(\Psi(\bar{u}))) + 2g(\Delta_t \Psi(\bar{u}))^2 + 2\Gamma(g, \Psi(\bar{u}))\Delta_t \Psi(\bar{u})\, dm_t.$$

We calculate using the notation $\psi = \Psi(\bar{u})$, $\psi_i = \partial_i \Psi(\bar{u})$ and $\psi_{ij} = \partial_{ij}\Psi(\bar{u})$ for

the first term

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int -\Gamma_t(g,\Gamma_t(\Psi(\bar{u})))\,dm_t\\
=&\sum_{i,j}\Big\{\int -\Gamma_t(g\psi_i\psi_j,\Gamma_t(u_i,u_j))\,dm\\
&\qquad+\int g\Big(\Gamma_t(u_i,u_j)\Delta_t(\psi_i\psi_j)+2\Gamma_t(\psi_i\psi_j,\Gamma_t(u_i,u_j))\Big)\,dm_t\Big\}\\
=&\sum_{i,j}\int -\Gamma_t(g\psi_i\psi_j,\Gamma_t(u_i,u_j))\,dm+\int 2g\Big(I+II\Big)\,dm_t,
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$I=\sum_{i,j,k,h}\Gamma_t(u_i,u_j)\Big(\psi_i(\psi_{jk}\Delta_t u_k+\psi_{jkh}\Gamma_t(u_k,u_h))+\psi_{ik}\psi_{jh}\Gamma_t(u_k,u_h)\Big)$$

and

$$II=\sum_{i,j,k}\psi_i\psi_{jk}\Big(\Gamma_t(u_k,\Gamma_t(u_j,u_i))+\Gamma_t(u_j,\Gamma_t(u_i,u_k))\Big).$$

On the other hand

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int 2g(\Delta_t\Psi(\bar{u}))^2+2\Gamma_t(g,\Psi(\bar{u}))\Delta_t\Psi(\bar{u})\,dm_t\\
=&\sum_{i,j}2\int\Big(\Delta_t u_i\Delta_t u_j g\psi_i\psi_j+\Gamma_t(u_i,g\psi_i\psi_j)\Delta_t u_j\Big)\,dm_t\\
-&\sum_{i,j,k,h}\int 2g\Big(\psi_i\Delta_t u_k\psi_{kj}\Gamma_t(u_i,u_j)+\psi_i\Gamma_t(u_k,u_h)\psi_{khj}\Gamma_t(u_i,u_j)\\
&\qquad\qquad+\psi_i\psi_{jk}\Gamma_t(u_i,\Gamma_t(u_j,u_k))\Big)\,dm_t.
\end{aligned}$$

Adding up and collecting terms yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&2\Gamma_{2,t}(\Psi(\bar{u}))(g)\\
=&\sum_{i,j}\int\Big(-\Gamma_t(g\psi_i\psi_j,\Gamma_t(u_i,u_j))+2g\psi_i\psi_j\Delta_t u_i\Delta_t u_j+2\Gamma_t(u_i,g\psi_i\psi_j)\Delta_t u_j\Big)dm_t\\
+&\sum_{i,j,k}\int 2g\psi_i\psi_{jk}\Big(\Gamma_t(u_k,\Gamma_t(u_i,u_j))+\Gamma_t(u_j,\Gamma_t(u_i,u_k))-\Gamma_t(u_i,\Gamma_t(u_j,u_k))\Big)dm_t\\
+&\sum_{i,j,k,h}\int 2g\psi_{ik}\psi_{jk}\Gamma(u_k,u_h)\Gamma(u_i,u_j)\,dm_t\\
=&2\sum_{i,j}\Gamma_{2,t}(u_i,u_j)(g\psi_i\psi_j)+\sum_{i,j,k}\int 4g\psi_i\psi_{jk}(H_t[u_i](u_k,u_j))\,dm_t\\
&+\sum_{i,j,k,h}\int 2g\psi_{ik}\psi_{jk}\Gamma_t(u_k,u_h)\Gamma_t(u_i,u_j)\,dm_t
\end{aligned}$$

for each $g\in\mathcal{F}\cap L^\infty$.

For arbitrary $g \in \mathcal{F}$, set $g^n := g \wedge n$. Then, by dominated convergence (recall that $\tilde{g} \in L^1(X, \mu_+)$)

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{n\to\infty} \int g^n \, d\Gamma_{2,t}(\Psi(\bar{u})) &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \Big(\int g^n (\partial_t \Gamma_t)(\Psi(\bar{u})) \, dm_t + \int \tilde{g^n} \, d\mu_+ \Big) \\ &= \int g \, d\Gamma_{2,t}(\Psi(\bar{u})).\end{aligned}$$

Similarly we can pass to the limit for the other integrals and obtain for all $g \in \mathcal{F}$

$$\begin{aligned}2\Gamma_{2,t}(\Psi(\bar{u}))(g) &= 2 \sum_{i,j} \Gamma_{2,t}(u_i, u_j)(g\psi_i\psi_j) + \sum_{i,j,k} \int 4g\psi_i\psi_{jk}(H_t[u_i](u_k, u_j)) \, dm_t \\ &+ \sum_{i,j,k,h} \int 2g\psi_{ik}\psi_{jk}\Gamma_t(u_k, u_h)\Gamma_t(u_i, u_j) \, dm_t,\end{aligned}$$

and hence the result. □

Proposition 2.13. *Suppose that Bochner's inequality holds at time t. Then for every $u \in Dom(\Delta_t) \cap L^\infty(X, m_t)$ such that $\Gamma_t(u) \in L^\infty(X, m_t)$*

$$\Gamma_t(\Gamma_t(u)) \le 4\big(\gamma_{2,t}(u) - \frac{1}{2}\partial_t\Gamma_t(u)\big)\Gamma_t(u).$$

Proof. We choose the same polynomial $\Psi\colon \mathbb{R}^3 \to \mathbb{R}$ as in [19] by

$$\Psi(\bar{u}) := \lambda u_1 + (u_2 - a)(u_3 - b) - ab, \qquad \lambda, a, b \in \mathbb{R},$$

where $\bar{u} = (u_1, u_2, u_3)$, where each $u_i \in Dom(\Delta_t) \cap L^\infty(X, m_t)$ with $\Gamma_t(u_i) \in L^\infty(X, m_t)$. We apply Lemma 2.11 and obtain

$$\gamma_{2,t}(\Psi(\bar{u})) \ge \frac{1}{2}(\partial_t\Gamma_t)(\Psi(\bar{u})) \quad m\text{-a.e. in } X, \tag{23}$$

where both sides of the inequality depend on $\lambda, a, b \in \mathbb{R}$. Choosing λ, a, b in a dense and countable subset D of $\mathbb{R}$ yields that (23) holds m-a.e. for all λ, a, b in D. Since

$$(\partial_t\Gamma_t)(\Psi(\bar{u})) = \sum_{i,j} \partial_i\Psi(\bar{u})\partial_j\Psi(\bar{u})(\partial_t\Gamma_t)(u_i, u_j),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_{2,t}(\Psi(\bar{u})) = &\sum_{i,j} \partial_i\Psi(\bar{u})\partial_j\Psi(\bar{u})\gamma_{2,t}(u_i, u_j) + 2\sum_{i,j,k} \partial_i\Psi(\bar{u})\partial_{jk}\Psi(\bar{u})H_t[u^i](u_j, u_k) \\ &+ \sum_{i,j,k,h} \partial_{ik}\Psi(\bar{u})\partial_{jh}\Psi(\bar{u})\Gamma_t(u_i, u_j)\Gamma_t(u_k, u_h),\end{aligned}$$

cf. [19, Lemma 3.3], both sides are continuous in λ, a, b, and hence we conclude that (23) holds for all λ, a, b in $\mathbb{R}$.

Thus, for m-a.e. $x \in X$ we may set $a := u_2(x)$, $b := u_3(x)$ so that

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_1\Psi(\bar{u})(x) = \lambda, \quad \partial_2\Psi(\bar{u})(x) = 0 = \partial_3\Psi(\bar{u})(x) \\ \partial_{23}\Psi(\bar{u})(x) = 1 = \partial_{32}\Psi(\bar{u})(x), \quad \partial_{ij}\Psi(\bar{u})(x) = 0 \text{ else},\end{aligned}$$

m-a.e., and exploiting (23) yields

$$\lambda^2\gamma_{2,t}(u_1) + 4\lambda H_t[u^1](u_2,u_3) + 2\Big(\Gamma_t(u_2,u_3)^2 + \Gamma_t(u_2)\Gamma_t(u_3)\Big) \geq \frac{1}{2}\lambda^2(\partial_t\Gamma_t)(u_1).$$

Using Cauchy-Schwartz inequality $\Gamma_t(u_2,u_3)^2 \leq \Gamma_t(u_2)\Gamma_t(u_3)$ this can be transformed into

$$\lambda^2\Big(\gamma_{2,t}(u_1) - \frac{1}{2}(\partial_t\Gamma_t)(u_1)\Big) + 4\lambda H_t[u^1](u_2,u_3) + 4\Gamma_t(u_2)\Gamma_t(u_3) \geq 0,$$

and since λ is arbitrary [12, Lemma 3.3.6] we obtain

$$(H_t[u_1](u_2,u_3))^2 \leq \Big(\gamma_{2,t}(u_1) - \frac{1}{2}(\partial_t\Gamma_t)(u_1)\Big)\Gamma_t(u_2)\Gamma_t(u_3).$$

From the definition of the Hessian we deduce that

$$H_t[u_1](u_2,u_3) + H_t[u_2](u_1,u_3) = \Gamma_t(\Gamma_t(u_1,u_2),u_3)$$

and consequently

$$|\Gamma_t(\Gamma_t(u_1,u_2),u_3)| \leq \sqrt{\Gamma_t(u_3)}\Big(\sqrt{\gamma_{2,t}(u_1) - \frac{1}{2}(\partial_t\Gamma_t)(u_1)}\sqrt{\Gamma_t(u_2)} \tag{24}$$

$$+\sqrt{\gamma_{2,t}(u_2) - \frac{1}{2}(\partial_t\Gamma_t)(u_2)}\sqrt{\Gamma_t(u_1)}\Big). \tag{25}$$

We obtain (24) for arbitrary $u_3 \in \mathcal{F}\cap L^\infty(X,m_t)$ by approximating u_3 by a sequence u_3^n converging in energy with

$$\Gamma_t(u_3^n) \to \Gamma_t(u), \qquad \Gamma_t(u_3^n,\Gamma_t(u_1,u_2)) \to \Gamma_t(u_3,\Gamma_t(u_1,u_2))$$

pointwise and in $L^1(X,m_t)$, cf. Theorem 3.4 in [19] Hence we may choose $u_3 = \Gamma_t(u_1,u_2)$, and obtain the result choosing $u_1 = u_2$.

□

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 1.2. We will assume that

$$u_r \in \mathrm{Lip}(X) \text{ for all } r \in (s,t) \text{ with } \sup_{r,x} \mathrm{lip}_r u_r(x) < \infty. \tag{26}$$

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Define for each $\varepsilon > 0$ the concave and smooth function $\omega_\varepsilon(\cdot) := (\varepsilon+\cdot)^\alpha - \varepsilon^\alpha$. Note that this function satisfies

$$2\omega_\varepsilon'(r) + 4r\omega_\varepsilon''(r) \geq 0. \tag{27}$$

For each $s,t \in (0,T)$ under consideration as well as $u \in \mathrm{Lip}(X)$ and $g \in \mathcal{F}\cap L^\infty$ with $g \geq 0$, we set $u_r = P_{r,s}u$, $g_r = P^*_{t,r}g$ for $r \in [s,t]$. Note that for a.e. $r \in [s,t]$ $u_r \in Dom(\Delta_r)$ and $u, \Gamma_r(u) \in L^\infty(X,m_r)$.

We consider the function

$$h_r^\varepsilon := \int g_r\omega_\varepsilon(\Gamma_r(u_r))dm_r.$$

Choose $s \leq \sigma < \tau \leq t$ and $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small that $\sigma \leq \tau - \delta$ such that

$$h_\tau^\varepsilon \leq \liminf_{\delta\searrow 0}\frac{1}{\delta}\int_{\tau-\delta}^{\tau} h_r dr \quad \text{and} \quad h_\sigma^\varepsilon \geq \limsup_{\delta\searrow 0}\frac{1}{\delta}\int_{\sigma}^{\sigma+\delta} h_r dr. \tag{28}$$

Note that by Lebesgue's density theorem, this is true at least for a.e. $\sigma \geq s$ and for a.e. $\tau \leq t$. Then from

$$\int_{\tau-\sigma}^{\tau} h_r\,dr - \int_{\sigma}^{\sigma+\delta} h_r\,dr = \int_{\sigma}^{\tau-\delta} (h_{r+\delta} - h_r)\,dr,$$

and the concavity of ω_ε we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
h^\varepsilon_\tau - h^\varepsilon_\sigma \leq & \liminf_{\delta\searrow 0} \frac{1}{\delta}\int_\sigma^{\tau-\delta} \big[h_{r+\delta} - h_r\big]dr \\
\leq & \limsup_{\delta\searrow 0} \frac{1}{\delta}\int_\sigma^{\tau-\delta}\int_X \omega_\varepsilon(\Gamma_{r+\delta}(u_{r+\delta}))d(\mu_{r+\delta}-\mu_r)\,dr \\
& + \liminf_{\delta\searrow 0} \frac{1}{\delta}\int_\sigma^{\tau-\delta}\int_X g_r\omega'_\varepsilon(\Gamma_r(u_r))\Big[\Gamma_{r+\delta}(u_r) - \Gamma_r(u_r)\Big]dm_r\,dr \\
& + \limsup_{\delta\searrow 0} \frac{1}{\delta}\int_\sigma^{\tau-\delta}\int_X g_r\omega'_\varepsilon(\Gamma_r(u_r))\Gamma_{r+\delta}(u_{r+\delta}, u_{r+\delta}-u_r)\,dm_r \\
& + \limsup_{\delta\searrow 0} \frac{1}{\delta}\int_\sigma^{\tau-\delta}\int_X g_r\omega'_\varepsilon(\Gamma_r(u_r))\Gamma_{r+\delta}(u_{r+\delta}-u_r, u_r)\,dm_r\,dr \\
=: & (I) + (II) + (III') + (III'').
\end{aligned}$$

Let us denote with a slight abuse of notation $\hat{g}_r = g_r\omega'_\varepsilon(\Gamma_r(u_r))$. Note that $\hat{g} \in L^1\cap L^\infty(X)$ and $\hat{g} \in \mathcal{F}$. Each of the four terms will be considered separately. Since $r \mapsto \mu_r$ is a solution to the dual heat equation, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(I) = & \limsup_{\delta\searrow 0} \frac{1}{\delta}\int_\sigma^{\tau-\delta}\int_X \omega_\epsilon(\Gamma_{r+\delta}(u_{r+\delta}))\cdot\Big(-\int_r^{r+\delta}\Delta_q g_q\,dm_q\,dq\Big)dr \\
= & -\liminf_{\delta\searrow 0}\int_{\sigma+\delta}^{\tau}\int_X \omega_\varepsilon(\Gamma_r(u_r))\Big(\frac{1}{\delta}\int_{r-\delta}^{r}\Delta_q g_q e^{-f_q}\,dq\Big)dm_\diamond\,dr \\
= & -\int_\sigma^\tau\int_X \omega_\varepsilon(\Gamma_r(u_r))\cdot\Delta_r g_r\,dm_r\,dr
\end{aligned}$$

due Lebesgue's density theorem applied to $r \mapsto \Delta_r g_r e^{-f_r}$. Note that the latter function is in L^2 (Theorem 2.4) and the function $r \mapsto \omega_\varepsilon(\Gamma_r(u_r))$ is in L^∞ thanks to (26).

The second term can estimated according to Proposition 2.6:

$$\begin{aligned}
(II) = & \liminf_{\delta\searrow 0}\frac{1}{\delta}\int_\sigma^{\tau-\delta}\int_X \hat{g}_r\Big[\Gamma_{r+\delta}(u_r) - \Gamma_r(u_r)\Big]dm_r\,dr \\
= & \int_\sigma^\tau\int_X \hat{g}_r\,(\partial_r\Gamma_r)(u_r)dm_r dr.
\end{aligned}$$

The term (III') is transformed as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
& (III') \\
= & \limsup_{\delta\searrow 0}\frac{1}{\delta}\int_\sigma^{\tau-\delta}\int_X \hat{g}_{r+\delta}\Gamma_{r+\delta}(u_{r+\delta}, u_{r+\delta}-u_r)\,dm_{r+\delta}\,dr \\
= & -\liminf_{\delta\searrow 0}\int_\sigma^{\tau-\delta}\int_X \Big(\Gamma_{r+\delta}(\hat{g}_{r+\delta}, u_{r+\delta}) + \hat{g}_{r+\delta}\,\Delta_{r+\delta}u_{r+\delta}\Big)\Big(\frac{1}{\delta}\int_r^{r+\delta}\Delta_q u_q\,dq\Big)dm_{r+\delta}\,dr \\
= & -\int_\sigma^\tau\int_X \Big(\Gamma_r(\hat{g}_r, u_r) + \hat{g}_r\,\Delta_r u_r\Big)\cdot\Delta_r u_r\,dm_r\,dr.
\end{aligned}$$

Here again we used Lebesgue's density theorem (applied to $r \mapsto \Delta_r u_r$) and the 'nearly continuity' of $r \mapsto \hat{g}_r$ as map from (s,t) into $L^2(X,m)$ and as map into $\mathcal{F}$ (Lusin's theorem). Moreover, we used the boundedness (uniformly in r and x) of g_r and of $\Gamma_r(u_r)$ as well as the square integrability of $\Delta_r u_r$.

Similarly, the term (III'') will be transformed:

$$\begin{aligned}(III'') &= \limsup_{\delta \searrow 0} \frac{1}{\delta} \int_\sigma^{\tau-\delta} \int_X \hat{g}_r \Gamma_r(u_{r+\delta} - u_r, u_r)\, dm_r\, dr \\ &= -\liminf_{\delta \searrow 0} \frac{1}{\delta} \int_\sigma^{\tau-\delta} \int_X \Big(\Gamma_r(\hat{g}_r, u_r) + \hat{g}_r \Delta_r u_r\Big) \cdot \Big(\int_r^{r+\delta} \Delta_q u_q\, dq\Big) dm_r\, dr \\ &= -\int_\sigma^\tau \int_X \Big(\Gamma_r(\hat{g}_r, u_r) + \hat{g}_r\, \Delta_r u_r\Big) \cdot \Big(\Delta_r u_r\Big) dm_r\, dr.\end{aligned}$$

We therefore obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&h_\tau^\varepsilon - h_\sigma^\varepsilon = (I) + (II) + (III') + (III'') \\ \leq &\int_\sigma^\tau \int_X \Big[-\omega_\varepsilon(\Gamma_r(u_r)) \cdot \Delta_r g_r + \hat{g}_r\, (\partial_r \Gamma_r)(u_r) - 2\big(\Gamma_r(\hat{g}_r, u_r) + \hat{g}_r\, \Delta_r u_r\big)\, \Delta_r u_r \Big] dm_r\, dr \\ = &\int_\sigma^\tau \int \Big[\Gamma_r(\Gamma_r(u_r), \hat{g}_r) - \Gamma_r(\Gamma_r(u_r)) \omega_\varepsilon''(\Gamma_r(u_r)) g_r + \hat{g}_r\, (\partial_r \Gamma_r)(u_r) \\ &\qquad - 2\big(\Gamma_r(\hat{g}_r, u_r) + \hat{g}_r\, \Delta_r u_r\big)\, \Delta_r u_r \Big] dm_r\, dr \\ = &\int_\sigma^\tau -2\Gamma_{2,r}(u_r)(\hat{g}_r)\, dr - \int_\sigma^\tau \int \Big[\Gamma_r(\Gamma_r(u_r)) \omega_\varepsilon''(\Gamma_r(u_r)) g_r + \hat{g}_r\, (\partial_r \Gamma_r)(u_r)\Big] dm_r\, dr.\end{aligned}$$

Applying (22), Proposition 2.13, (27) and taking into account the concavity of ω_ε we further deduce for a.e. $r \in [s,t]$,

$$\begin{aligned}&h_\tau^\varepsilon - h_\sigma^\varepsilon \\ \leq &\int_\sigma^\tau \int_X \Big[-2\gamma_{2,r}(u_r)\hat{g}_r + \hat{g}_r\, (\partial_r \Gamma_r)(u_r) - \Gamma_r(\Gamma_r(u_r)) \omega_\varepsilon''(\Gamma_r(u_r)) g_r \Big]\, dm_r\, dr \\ \leq &\int_\sigma^\tau \int_X \Big[-g_r \Big(\gamma_{2,r}(u_r) - \frac{1}{2}(\partial_r \Gamma_r)(u_r)\Big) \Big(2\omega_\varepsilon'(\Gamma_r(u_r)) + 4\omega_\varepsilon''(\Gamma_r(u_r))\Gamma_r(u_r)\Big)\Big]\, dm_r\, dr \\ \leq &0.\end{aligned}$$

Hence we showed that, given u and g, there exists exceptional sets (which are null sets) for τ and σ outside of these sets

$$\int_X \omega_\varepsilon(\Gamma_\tau(P_{\tau,\sigma} u)) g\, dm_\tau - \int_X P_{\tau,\sigma} \omega_\varepsilon(\Gamma_\sigma(u))\, g\, dm_\tau \leq 0 \tag{29}$$

holds. Choosing g's from a dense countable set one may achieve that the exceptional sets for σ and τ in (29) do not depend on g. Next we may assume that $\sigma, \tau \in [s,t]$ with $\sigma < \tau$ is chosen such that (29) simultaneously holds for all u from a dense countable set $\mathcal{C}_1$ in $\mathrm{Lip}(X)$. We approximate arbitrary $u \in \mathrm{Lip}(X)$ by $u_n \in \mathcal{C}_1$ in energy and in L^2 such that $\sqrt{\Gamma_\tau(P_{\tau,\sigma} u_n)} \rightharpoonup G$ in L^2, for some $G \in L^2(X)$. This is possible since $||\sqrt{\Gamma_\tau(P_{\tau,\sigma} u_n)}||_{L^2(X)}$ is uniformly bounded. Then we have on the one hand

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} \int_X P_{\tau,\sigma} \omega_\varepsilon(\Gamma_\sigma(u_n))\, g\, dm_\tau \leq \int_X P_{\tau,\sigma} \omega_\varepsilon(\Gamma_\sigma(u))\, g\, dm_\tau \tag{30}$$

since

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_X P_{\tau,\sigma}\omega_\varepsilon(\Gamma_\sigma(u_n))\,g\,dm_\tau - \int_X P_{\tau,\sigma}\omega_\varepsilon(\Gamma_\sigma(u))\,g\,dm_\tau\\
\le&\int_X P^*_{\tau,\sigma}g\,\omega'_\varepsilon(\Gamma_\sigma(u))(\Gamma_\sigma(u_n)-\Gamma_\sigma(u))\,dm_\sigma\\
\le&||P^*_{\tau,\sigma}g\,\omega'_\varepsilon(\Gamma_\sigma(u))||_{L^\infty(X)}\left|\int_X \Gamma_\sigma(u_n)-\Gamma_\sigma(u)\,dm_\sigma\right|.
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand we find

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty}\int_X \omega_\varepsilon(\Gamma_\tau(P_{\tau,\sigma}u_n))g\,dm_\tau \ge \int_X \omega_\varepsilon(\Gamma_\tau(P_{\tau,\sigma}u))g\,dm_\tau. \tag{31}$$

Indeed, since $P_{\tau,\sigma}u_n \to P_{\tau,\sigma}u$ and $\sqrt{\Gamma(P_{\tau,\sigma}u_n)} \rightharpoonup G$ in $L^2(X)$ we know $\Gamma(P_{\tau,\sigma}u) \le G^2$ m-a.e. and hence

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_X \omega_\varepsilon(\Gamma_\tau(P_{\tau,\sigma}u_n))g\,dm_\tau - \int_X \omega_\varepsilon(\Gamma_\tau(P_{\tau,\sigma}u))g\,dm_\tau\\
=&\int_X \tilde\omega_\varepsilon(\sqrt{\Gamma_\tau(P_{\tau,\sigma}u_n)})g\,dm_\tau - \int_X \tilde\omega_\varepsilon(\sqrt{\Gamma_\tau(P_{\tau,\sigma}u)})g\,dm_\tau\\
\ge&\int_X \tilde\omega'_\varepsilon(\sqrt{\Gamma_\tau(P_{\tau,\sigma}u)})(\sqrt{\Gamma_\tau(P_{\tau,\sigma}u_n)}-\sqrt{\Gamma_\tau(P_{\tau,\sigma}u)})g\,dm_\tau\\
\ge&\int_X \tilde\omega'_\varepsilon(\sqrt{\Gamma_\tau(P_{\tau,\sigma}u)})(\sqrt{\Gamma_\tau(P_{\tau,\sigma}u_n)}-G)g\,dm_\tau,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde\omega(r)=\omega(r^2)$, which is convex and monotone. Combining (29), (30) and (31) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_X \omega_\varepsilon(\Gamma_\tau(P_{\tau,\sigma}u))g\,dm_\tau - \int_X P_{\tau,\sigma}\omega_\varepsilon(\Gamma_\sigma(u))\,g\,dm_\tau\\
\le&\liminf_n\int_X \omega_\varepsilon(\Gamma_\tau(P_{\tau,\sigma}u_n))g\,dm_\tau - \limsup_n\int_X P_{\tau,\sigma}\omega_\varepsilon(\Gamma_\sigma(u_n))\,g\,dm_\tau\\
\le&\liminf_n\left(\int_X \omega_\varepsilon(\Gamma_\tau(P_{\tau,\sigma}u_n))g\,dm_\tau - \int_X P_{\tau,\sigma}\omega_\varepsilon(\Gamma_\sigma(u_n))\,g\,dm_\tau\right)\le 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Letting $\varepsilon\to 0$ we showed that

$$\int_X(\Gamma_\tau(P_{\tau,\sigma}u))^\alpha g\,dm_\tau \le \int_X P_{\tau,\sigma}(\Gamma_\sigma(u)^\alpha)\,g\,dm_\tau. \tag{32}$$

Since $\mathrm{Lip}(X)$ is dense in $\mathcal{F}$ we can extend (32) to arbitrary $u\in\mathcal{F}$. Since g is arbitrary we obtain the result. □

3 Application to super-Ricci flows and couplings of Brownian motions

In this section we apply the previous results to super-Ricci flows as defined in [22]. The defining property is the relative entropy $S\colon I\times\mathcal{P}(X)\to(-\infty,\infty]$ given by

$$S_t(\mu)=\int\rho\log\rho\,dm_t$$

whenever $\mu=\rho m_t$, and $S_t(\mu)=\infty$ otherwise.

Definition 3.1 (Theorem 1.3 in [14]). *We say that (X, d_t, m_t) is a super-Ricci flow if one of the following equivalent assertions holds*

i) For a.e. $t \in (0,T)$ and every W_t-geodesic $(\mu^a)_{a\in[0,1]}$ in $\mathcal{P}(X)$ with $\mu^0, \mu^1 \in Dom(S)$

$$\partial_a^+ S_t(\mu^a)\big|_{a=1-} - \partial_a^- S_t(\mu^a)\big|_{a=0+} \geq -\frac{1}{2}\partial_t^- W_{t-}^2(\mu^0,\mu^1) \tag{33}$$

('dynamic convexity').

ii) For all $0 \leq s < t \leq T$ and $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$

$$W_s(\hat{P}_{t,s}\mu, \hat{P}_{t,s}\nu) \leq W_t(\mu,\nu) \tag{34}$$

('transport estimate').

iii) For all $u \in Dom(\mathcal{E})$ and all $0 < s < t < T$

$$\big|\nabla_t(P_{t,s}u)\big|_*^2 \leq P_{t,s}\big(|\nabla_s u|_*^2\big) \tag{35}$$

('gradient estimate').

iv) For all $0 < s < t < T$ and for all $u_s, g_t \in \mathcal{F}$ with $g_t \geq 0$, $g_t \in L^\infty$, $u_s \in \mathrm{Lip}(X)$ and for a.e. $r \in (s,t)$

$$\mathbf{\Gamma}_{2,r}(u_r)(g_r) \geq \frac{1}{2}\int \overset{\bullet}{\Gamma}_r(u_r) g_r dm_r \tag{36}$$

('dynamic Bochner inequality' or 'dynamic Bakry-Emery condition') where $u_r = P_{r,s}u_s$ and $g_r = P_{t,r}^* g_t$. Moreover, the regularity assumption (26) is satisfied.

The following corollary is a consequence of Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2. In particular, choosing $\mu = \delta_x$ and $\nu = \delta_y$ for some arbitrary $x, y \in X$, Corollary 3.2 implies for $p = \infty$

$$W_{\infty,s}(\hat{P}_{t,s}\delta_x, \hat{P}_{t,s}\delta_y) \leq d_t(x,y). \tag{37}$$

Corollary 3.2. *Suppose that $(X, d_t, m_t)_{t\in I}$ is a super-Ricci flow satisfying the assumptions in Theorem 1.1. Then*

i) for every $u \in \mathcal{F} \cap L^\infty(X, m_s)$ and every $\beta \in [1,2]$

$$|\nabla_t P_{t,s}u|_*^\beta \leq P_{t,s}(|\nabla_s u|_*^\beta), \tag{38}$$

ii) for every $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ and every $p \in [1,\infty]$

$$W_{p,s}(\hat{P}_{t,s}\mu, \hat{P}_{t,s}\nu) \leq W_{p,t}(\mu,\nu). \tag{39}$$

Proof. Note that, taking into account $\Gamma(u) = |\nabla u|_*^2$ due to our static Riemannian curvature bound, (38) holds at least for a.e. $s \leq t$ by Definition 3.1, Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2. Then applying Kuwada's duality [15, Theorem 2.2] implies that (39) holds at all these time instances. Indeed, (38) implies that

for all $u \in \mathrm{Lip}_b(X)$, $|\nabla_t P_{t,s} u|_* \le P_{t,s}(|\nabla_s u|_*^\beta)^{1/\beta}$ and thus by Proposition 3.11 in [3] $\mathrm{lip}_t P_{t,s} u \le P_{t,s}(|\nabla_s u|_*^\beta)^{1/\beta}$. We obtain

$$\mathrm{lip}_t(P_{t,s}u) \le P_{t,s}(\mathrm{lip}_s(u)^\beta)^{1/\beta}$$

by virtue of $|\nabla u|_* \le \mathrm{lip}\, u$ (Lemma 4.4 in [1]) and the monotonicity of the functions $P_{t,s}$, r^β and $r^{1/\beta}$. We deduce from Theorem 2.2 in [15] for a.e. $s \le t$

$$W_{p,s}(\hat{P}_{t,s}\mu, \hat{P}_{t,s}\nu) \le W_{p,t}(\mu,\nu),$$

where p is the Hölder conjugate of β; $1/p + 1/\beta = 1$. Since both sides of (39) are continuous in s and t (see Lemma 3.3 below), we obtain that (39) holds for all times $s \le t$ and thus also (38) holds for all times by Theorem 2.2 in [15]. The same applies to $p = 1$ in (38) by noting that $\mathrm{lip}_t(P_{t,s}u) \le P_{t,s}(\mathrm{lip}_s(u)^\beta)^{1/\beta}$ for all $\beta \ge 2$ by virtue of Jensen's inequality. □

Lemma 3.3. *We obtain the following continuity estimate for the heat flow $\mu_s = \hat{P}_{t,s}\mu$, where $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$. There exist constants $c, c' > 0$ depending only on K, N and L such that*

$$W_{p,t}(\mu_s, \mu_{s'})^p \le c|s - s'|^{p/2} e^{c'|s-s'|/2}.$$

for all $0 \le s, s' \le t$.

Proof. Assume $0 < s < s' < t$. Then by $\mu_s = \hat{P}_{s',s}\mu_{s'}$ we estimate

$$W_{p,t}(\mu_s, \mu_{s'})^p \le \int\int d_t^p(x,y) p_{s',s}(x,y)\, dm_s(y)\, d\mu_{s'}(x).$$

By virtue of the Gaussian upper bounds ([17, Section 4]) and the Bishop Gromov volume comparison in $\mathrm{RCD}(K,N)$ spaces ([20, Theorem 2.3]) we obtain for $\sigma = s' - s$ and $B_t(r,x)$ denoting the ball of radius r around x in the metric space (X, d_t)

$$p_{s',s}(x,y) \le \frac{C}{m_t(B_t(\sqrt{\sigma}, x))} \cdot \exp\Big(-\frac{d_t^2(x,y)}{C\sigma}\Big)$$
$$A(R,x) \le \Big(\frac{R}{r}\Big)^{N-1} \cdot e^{R\sqrt{|K|(N-1)}} \cdot A(r,x)$$

for $R \ge r$ where $A(r,x) = \partial_{r+} m_t(B_t(r,x))$ and thus (by integrating from 0 to $\sqrt{\sigma}$)

$$A(R,x) \le N\frac{R^{N-1}}{\sigma^{N/2}} \cdot e^{R\sqrt{|K|(N-1)}} \cdot m_t(B_t(\sqrt{\sigma}, x))$$

for $R \ge \sqrt{\sigma}$. Then estimating further yields (with varying constants)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int\int d_t^p(x,y) p_{s',s}(x,y)\, dm_s(y)\, d\mu_{s'}(x) \\
&\le \int_X \Big[\frac{C}{m_t(B_t(\sqrt{\sigma},x))} \cdot \int_X d_t^p(x,y) \cdot \exp\Big(-\frac{d_t^2(x,y)}{C\sigma}\Big) dm_t(y)\Big] d\mu_{s'}(x) \\
&\le C\sigma^{p/2} + C\int_X \int_{\sqrt{\sigma}}^\infty R^p \cdot \exp\Big(-\frac{R^2}{C\sigma}\Big) N\frac{R^{N-1}}{\sigma^{N/2}} \cdot e^{R\sqrt{|K|(N-1)}}\, dR\, d\mu_{s'}(x) \\
&\le C\sigma^{p/2} + c''\sigma^{p/2} e^{c'\sigma/2} \le c\sigma^{p/2} e^{c'\sigma/2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

□

Brownian motions

In the remainder of this section we follow the approach in [21] and construct couplings of two Brownian motions $(X_s^1)_{s\le t}, (X_s^2)_{s\le t}$ on X such that the distance d_s between X_s^1 and X_s^2 does not increase.

Definition 3.4. *Let $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ and $t \in I$. We call a stochastic process $(X_s)_{s\le t}$ on a probability space $(\Omega, \Sigma, \mathbb{P})$ with values in X a Brownian motion on X with initial distribution μ if the process is sample-continuous and if for all $s \le t$*

$$\mathbb{P}[X_s \in A] = \hat{P}_{t,s}(\mu)(A) = \int_X \int_A p_{t,s}(x,y)\, dm_s(y)\, d\mu(x).$$

Remark. *Let us remark that the Brownian motion defined here has time-dependent generator Δ_s instead of $\frac{1}{2}\Delta_s$. This is only for convenience and the stochastic process with generators $(\frac{1}{2}\Delta_s)_{s\le t/2}$ is given by $(\tilde{X}_s)_{s\le t/2}$, where $\tilde{X}_s := X_{2s}$.*

In order to prove existence of a Brownian motion we consider for fixed $t \in I$ the finite subset $J = \{t_1, \cdots, t_r\}$ of $(0,t]$ and the finite dimensional distribution P_J^μ, where $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$, defined by

$$\begin{aligned} &P_J^\mu(B_r \times \ldots \times B_1) \\ &:= \int_X \int_{B_r} \cdots \int_{B_1} p_{t_2,t_1}(x_{t_2}, x_{t_1})\, dm_{t_1}(x_{t_1}) \ldots p_{t,t_r}(x, x_{t_r})\, dm_{t_r}(x_{t_r})\, d\mu(x). \end{aligned}$$

The family of probability measures $\{P_J^\mu | J \text{ finite } \subset (0,t]\}$ defines a projective family, hence the Kolmogorov extension theorem [7, Theorem 35.5] implies that there exists a unique probability measure $P_{(0,t]}^\mu$ on $(X^{(0,t]}, \mathcal{B}(X)^{(0,t]})$ such that $(\pi_J)_\# P_{(0,t]}^\mu = P_J^\mu$. Here, π_J denotes the projection $\omega \mapsto (\omega(t_1), \ldots, \omega(t_r))$ from $X^{(0,t]}$ to X^r.

For every $s \in (0,t]$ the map $\pi_s \colon \omega \mapsto \omega(s)$ from $X^{(0,t]}$ to X is a stochastic process with finite-dimensional distributions $(P_J^\mu)_J$. The following Proposition yields existence of a continuous modification $(X_s)_{s\le t}$, and hence a Brownian motion.

Proposition 3.5. *For each $t \in I$ and each $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ there exists a Brownian motion on X with initial distribution μ, which is unique in law.*

Proof. We need to show that there exists positive constants $\alpha, \beta, c > 0$ such that the above mentioned process π_s satisfies

$$E[d(\pi_{s'}, \pi_s)^\alpha] \le c|s - s'|^{1+\beta} \tag{41}$$

for all $s', s \in (0,t]$. Then the Kolmogorov continuity theorem [7, Theorem 39.3] implies that there exists a modification $(X_s)_{s\le t}$ such that the map $s \mapsto X_s(\omega)$ is continuous for $P_{(0,t]}^\mu$-a.e ω. Hence the process $(X_s)_{s\le t}$ on the probability space $(X^{(0,t]}, \mathcal{B}(X)^{(0,t]}, P_{(0,t]}^\mu)$ yields the desired properties. For $\alpha > 2$ (41) follows from (40) in the proof of Lemma 3.3.

Since all finite-dimensional distributions are uniquely determined this process is unique in law. □

Couplings of Brownian motions

We introduce the σ-field $\mathcal{B}^u(X^2) := \bigcap_{\nu\in\mathcal{P}(X^2)} \mathcal{B}^\nu(X^2)$ of universally measurable subsets of X^2, i.e. the intersection of all $\mathcal{B}^\nu(X^2)$, where ν runs through the set $\mathcal{P}(X^2)$ and where $\mathcal{B}^\nu(X^2)$ denotes the completion of the Borel σ-field on X^2 w.r.t. $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(X^2)$. Let $\mathrm{D} := \{k2^{-n} | k, n \in \mathbb{N}\} \cap (0, t]$ denote the set of nonnegative dyadic number s in $(0, t]$ and $\mathrm{D}_n := \{k2^{-n} | k \in \mathbb{N}\} \cap (0, t]$ for fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

In the remainder we will assume that the transport estimate (39) holds for all $p \in [1, \infty]$.

Lemma 3.6. *For each $s \le t$ there exists a Markov kernel $q^*_{t,s}$ on $(X^2, \mathcal{B}^u(X^2))$ with the following properties:*

i) For each $(x, y) \in X^2$ the probability measure $q^*_{t,s}((x, y), \cdot)$ is a coupling of the probability measures $p_{t,s}(x, \cdot)$ and $p_{t,s}(y, \cdot)$.

ii) For each $(x, y) \in X^2$ and $q^*_{t,s}((x, y), \cdot)$-a.e. $(x', y') \in X^2$

$$d_s(x', y') \le d_t(x, y).$$

Proof. By virtue of the transport estimate (37) there exists at least one probability measures with properties *i)* and *ii)*. Indeed, define $\mu_s = \hat{P}_{t,s}\delta_x$, $\nu_s = \hat{P}_{t,s}\delta_y$ and let $\gamma_p \in \Pi(\mu_s, \nu_s)$ such that $W_{p,s}(\mu_s, \nu_s) = ||d_s||_{L^p(\gamma_p)}$. Since $\gamma_p \in \Pi(\mu_s, \nu_s)$, $(\gamma_p)_{p\in\mathbb{N}}$ is tight ([24, Lemma 4.4]) and hence there exists a subsequence p_k and a probability measure γ such that γ_{p_k} weakly converges to γ. Since $\Pi(\mu_s, \nu_s)$ is closed we obtain that $\gamma \in \Pi(\mu_s, \nu_s)$. Moreover, since $d_s \wedge R \in \mathcal{C}_b(X \times X)$

$$||d_s \wedge R||_{L^p(\gamma)} = \lim_{k\to\infty} ||d_s \wedge R||_{L^p(\gamma_{p_k})} \le \lim_{k\to\infty} ||d_s||_{L^{p_k}(\gamma_{p_k})} \le d_t(x, y),$$

where the second inequality follows from the Hölder inequality and the last from Corollary 2.15. Letting $R \to \infty$ and $p \to \infty$, we obtain

$$||d_s||_{L^\infty(\gamma)} \le d_t(x, y).$$

Hence the set of all these couplings γ is non-empty and satisfies *i)* and *ii)*. Moreover, for given $x, y \in X$ this set is closed w.r.t. weak convergence in $\mathcal{P}(X^2)$. According to a measurable selection theorem [8, Theorem 6.9.2] we may choose a coupling $q^*_{t,s}((x, y), \cdot)$ such that the map

$$(x, y) \mapsto q^*_{t,s}((x, y), \cdot), \qquad (X^2, \mathcal{B}^u(X^2)) \to (\mathcal{P}(X^2), \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}(X^2)))$$

is measurable. □

Lemma 3.7. *For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $s, s' \in \mathrm{D}_n$ there exists a Markov kernel $q^{(n)}_{s,s'}$ on $(X^2, \mathcal{B}^u(X^2))$ with the following properties:*

i) For each $(x, y) \in X^2$ the probability measure $q^{(n)}_{s,s'}((x, y), \cdot)$ is a coupling of $p_{s,s'}(x, \cdot)$ and $p_{s,s'}(y, \cdot)$.

ii) For each $(x, y) \in X^2$

$$d_{s'}(x', y') \le d_s(x, y)$$

for $q^{(n)}_{s,s'}((x, y), \cdot)$-a.e. (x', y').

Proof. For $s = l2^{-n}$ and $s' = k2^{-n}$ with $l \geq k$ we put

$$q^{(n)}_{s,s'} := q^*_{(k+1)2^{-n},s'} \circ \ldots \circ q^*_{s,(l-1)2^{-n}}.$$

Obviously we have for $r \in \mathrm{D}_n$ such that $s' \leq r \leq s$,

$$q^{(n)}_{r,s'} \circ q^{(n)}_{s,r} = q^{(n)}_{s,s'} \tag{42}$$

and the properties *i)* and *ii)* hold by iteration, cf. Lemma 2.3 in [21]. □

We fix a distribution $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(X^2)$ with marginals ν_1 and ν_2. Similarly as before for any finite subset $J = \{t_1, \ldots, t_r\}$ of D_n we consider the finite-dimensional distribution $Q^{(n)}_J$ on $(X^2)^{|J|}$

$$\begin{aligned} &Q^{(n)}_J(A_r \times \ldots \times A_1) \\ &= \int_{X^2} \int_{A_r} \ldots \int_{A_1} q^{(n)}_{t_2,t_1}((x_2,y_2), d(x_1,y_1)) \ldots q^{(n)}_{t,t_r}((x,y), d(x_r,y_r))\nu(d(x,y)), \end{aligned}$$

where $q^*_{t,t_r} = q^{(n)}_{l2^{-n},t_r} \circ q^*_{t,l2^{-n}}$ whenever $l2^{-n} < t < (l+1)2^{-n}$.

Lemma 3.8. *For fixed finite $J \subset \mathrm{D}_m$ the family $\{Q^{(n)}_J | n \in \mathbb{R}, n \geq m\}$ is a tight family of probability measures on $(X^2)^{|J|}$.*

Proof. Let $J = \{t_1, \ldots, t_r\}$ with each $t_i \in \mathrm{D}_m$. The families $\{\hat{P}_{t,t_i}(\nu_1) | i = 1, \ldots, r\}$ and $\{\hat{P}_{t,t_i}(\nu_2) | i = 1, \ldots, r\}$ are tight by virtue of Prokhorov's theorem, see e.g. [8]. This means that given $\varepsilon > 0$ there exist compact sets $B_1, B_2 \subset X$ such that for all $i = 1, \ldots, r$

$$\hat{P}_{t,t_i}(\nu_1)(X \setminus B_1) < \varepsilon, \quad \hat{P}_{t,t_i}(\nu_2)(X \setminus B_2) < \varepsilon.$$

Applying $A_1 \times A_2 \subset X \times A_2 \cup A_1 \times X$ and (42) yields for the compact set $\vec{B} = (B_1 \times B_2)^r$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned} Q^{(n)}_J((X^2)^r \setminus \vec{B}) \leq &\sum_{i=1}^r Q^{(n)}_{t,t_i}(X^2 \setminus B_1 \times B_2) \\ \leq &\sum_{i=1}^r \left[Q^{(n)}_{t,t_i}((X \setminus B_1) \times X) + Q^{(n)}_{t,t_i}((X \times (X \setminus B_2)) \right] \\ = &\sum_{i=1}^r \left[\hat{P}_{t,t_i}(\nu_1)(X \setminus B_1) + \hat{P}_{t,t_i}(\nu_2)(X \setminus B_2) \right] \\ \leq &2r\varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where the last two inequalities follow from *i)* of Lemma 3.7 and the tightness of $\{\hat{P}_{t,t_i}(\nu_j)\}_i$ respectively. Hence the family $\{Q^{(n)}_J | n \in \mathbb{R}, n \geq m\}$ is tight. □

For $J = \{t_1, \ldots, t_r\}$ as above we set

$$\vec{e_1} \colon (X^2)^r \to X^r, \quad ((x_1,y_1), \ldots, (x_r,y_r)) \mapsto (x_1, \ldots, x_r),$$

and similarly for $\vec{e_2}$.

Proposition 3.9. *There exists a projective family $\{Q^\nu_J | J \text{ finite } \subset \mathrm{D}\}$ of probability measures and a subsequence $(n_l)_{l\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that for each finite $J \subset \mathrm{D}$*

i) $Q^{(n_l)}_J \to Q^\nu_J$ weakly in $\mathcal{P}((X^2)^{|J|})$ as $l \to \infty$,

ii) and $(\vec{e_1})_\# Q^\nu_J = P^{\nu_1}_J$, $(\vec{e_2})_\# Q^\nu_J = P^{\nu_2}_J$.

In particular there exists a probability measure $Q^\nu_{\mathrm{D}} \in \mathcal{P}((X^2)^{\mathrm{D}})$ such that for all finite $J \subset \mathrm{D}$

$$(\pi_J)_\# Q^\nu_{\mathrm{D}} = Q^\nu_J$$

and

$$(\vec{e_1})_\# Q^\nu_{\mathrm{D}} = P^{\nu_1}_{\mathrm{D}}, \quad (\vec{e_2})_\# Q^\nu_{\mathrm{D}} = P^{\nu_2}_{\mathrm{D}}.$$

Proof. Lemma 3.8 yields for each fixed J the existence of a weakly converging subsequence $Q^{(n_l)}_J$ by virtue of Prokhorov's theorem. By a diagonal argument we may choose a subsequence such that $Q^{(n_l)}_J$ weakly converges for all finite $J \subset \mathrm{D}$. Note that

$$(\vec{e_1})_\# Q^{(n_l)}_J = P^{\nu_1}_J, \quad (\vec{e_2})_\# Q^{(n_l)}_J = P^{\nu_2}_J$$

and hence the same holds true for the limit. We obtain the last assertion by applying Kolmogorov's extension theorem. □

The next theorem is in particular true for super-Ricci flows satisfying additionally (11) and (12).

Theorem 3.10. *Let $(X, d_t, m_t)_{t\in I}$ be a family of RCD(K, N) spaces such that (4) and (5) hold. Moreover we assume that the transport estimate (39) holds for every $p \in [1, \infty]$. Then, for each $x, y \in X$, $t \in I$, there exists a continuous stochastic process $(X_s)_{s\le t}$ such that $(X_s)_{s\le t}$ is a coupling of the Brownian motions $(X^1_s)_{s\le t}$ and $(X^2_s)_{s\le t}$ with values in X and initial distributions δ_x and δ_y respectively and it satisfies for $Q^{(\delta_x,\delta_y)}_{\mathrm{D}}$-a.e. path*

$$d_s(X^1_s, X^2_s) \le d_t(x, y),$$

for each $s \le t$.

Proof. Set $\nu = (\nu_1, \nu_2) = (\delta_x, \delta_y)$. Consider the coordinate process $\pi_s = (\pi^1_s, \pi^2_s)\colon (X^2)^{\mathrm{D}} \to X^2$. Under Q^ν_{D} the process $(\pi^1_s)_{s\in\mathrm{D}}$ has distribution $P^{\nu_1}_{\mathrm{D}}$ and satisfies the continuity property (41). The corresponding statement holds true for the process $(\pi^2_s)_{s\in\mathrm{D}}$. Hence, the process $\pi_s = (\pi^1_s, \pi^2_s)$ satisfies the Kolmogorov continuity theorem for $\alpha > 2$ since

$$\begin{aligned} E[\hat{d}_t(\pi_s, \pi_{s'})^\alpha] \le& 2^{\alpha/2}\Big(E[d_t(\pi^1_s, \pi^1_{s'})^\alpha] + E[d_t(\pi^2_s, \pi^2_{s'})^\alpha]\Big) \\ \le& c2^{\alpha/2}|s - s'|^{\alpha/2}, \end{aligned}$$

with product metric $\hat{d}^2((x^1, y^1), (x^2, y^2)) = d^2(x^1, x^2) + d^2(y^1, y^2)$. Consequently there exists a continuous modification $(X_s)_{s\le t} = (X^1_s, X^2_s)_{s\le t}$ defined by $X_s = \lim_{s'\to s, s'\in\mathrm{D}} \pi_{s'}$ for Q^ν_{D}-a.e. ω and all $s \le t$, cf. Lemma 63.5 in [6]. The process $(X^i_s)_{s\le t}$, $i = 1, 2$ is a Brownian motion by continuity of $s \mapsto p_{t,s}(x, dy)$.

We need to justify that for Q^{ν}_{D}-a.e. path

$$d_s(X^1_s, X^2_s) \leq d_t(x, y).$$

For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let $Q^{(n)}_{\mathrm{D}_n}$ be the projective limit of the family $(Q^{(n)}_J)_{J \subset \mathrm{D}_n}$, which exists thanks to the Kolmogorov extension theorem. Consider the coordinate process $(\pi^{(n)}_s)_{s \in \mathrm{D}_n} = (\pi^{1,(n)}_s, \pi^{2,(n)}_s)_{s \in \mathrm{D}_n}$ from $(X^2)^{\mathrm{D}_n} \to X^2$. Then $Q^{(n)}_{\mathrm{D}_n}$-a.e. we have $d_s(\pi^{1,(n)}_s, \pi^{2,(n)}_s) \leq d_t(x, y)$ by virtue of Lemma 3.7. Applying Proposition 3.9 and *ii)* of Lemma 3.7 we obtain for a subsequence

$$\begin{aligned} &E\big[(d_s(\pi^1_s, \pi^2_s) \wedge R)^p\big]^{1/p} = \lim_{l \to \infty} E\big[(d_s(\pi^{1,(n_l)}_s, \pi^{2,(n_l)}_s) \wedge R)^p\big]^{1/p} \\ &\leq \lim_{l \to \infty} E\big[(d_t(x, y) \wedge R)^p\big]^{1/p} = d_t(x, y) \wedge R, \end{aligned}$$

for each $s \in \mathrm{D}$. Letting R and p tend to ∞ we find for each $s \in \mathrm{D}$

$$d_s(\pi^1_s, \pi^2_s) \leq d_t(x, y).$$

Since the process $(X_s)_{s \in \mathrm{D}}$ is a modification we get for each $s \in \mathrm{D}$ and Q^{ν}_{D}-a.e. $d_s(X^1_s, X^2_s) \leq d_t(x, y)$. Since $\mathrm{D} \subset (0, t]$ is a dense and countable subset we obtain the result by continuity of $s \mapsto X_s(\omega)$.

□

References

[1] Luigi Ambrosio, Nicola Gigli, and Giuseppe Savaré. Calculus and heat flow in metric measure spaces and applications to spaces with Ricci bounds from below. *Invent. Math.*, 195(2):289–391, 2013.

[2] Luigi Ambrosio, Nicola Gigli, and Giuseppe Savaré. Metric measure spaces with Riemannian Ricci curvature bounded from below. *Duke Math. J.*, 163(7):1405–1490, 2014.

[3] Luigi Ambrosio, Nicola Gigli, and Giuseppe Savaré. Bakry-Émery curvature-dimension condition and Riemannian Ricci curvature bounds. *Ann. Probab.*, 43(1):339–404, 2015.

[4] Marc Arnaudon, Kolehe Abdoulaye Coulibaly, and Anton Thalmaier. Brownian motion with respect to a metric depending on time; definition, existence and applications to Ricci flow. *Comptes Rendus Mathematique*, 346(13):773–778, 2008.

[5] D. Bakry. Transformations de Riesz pour les semi-groupes symétriques. II. étude sous la condition $\Gamma_2 \geq 0$. In *Séminaire de probabilités, XIX, 1983/84*, volume 1123 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 145–174. Springer, Berlin, 1985.

[6] Heinz Bauer. *Probability theory and elements of measure theory*. Academic Press, Inc. [Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers], London-New York, 1981. Second edition of the translation by R. B. Burckel from the third German edition, Probability and Mathematical Statistics.

[7] Heinz Bauer. *Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie*. de Gruyter Lehrbuch. [de Gruyter Textbook]. Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, fifth edition, 2002.

[8] V. Bogachev. *Measure Theory*, volume 1. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2007.

[9] Francois Bolley, Ivan Gentil, Arnaud Guillin, and Kazumasa Kuwada. Equivalence between dimensional contractions in Wasserstein distance and the curvature-dimension condition. *arXiv:1510.07793*, 2015.

[10] Zhen-Qing Chen and Masatoshi Fukushima. *Symmetric Markov processes, time change, and boundary theory*, volume 35 of *London Mathematical Society Monographs Series*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2012.

[11] Matthias Erbar, Kazumasa Kuwada, and Karl-Theodor Sturm. On the equivalence of the entropic curvature-dimension condition and Bochner's inequality on metric measure spaces. *Invent. Math.*, 201:993–1071, 2015.

[12] Nicola Gigli. Nonsmooth differential geometry-An approach tailored for spaces with Ricci curvature bounded from below. *arXiv:1407.0809*, 2014.

[13] Robert Haslhofer and Aaron Naber. Weak solutions for the Ricci flow I. *arXiv:1504.00911*, 2015.

[14] Eva Kopfer and Karl-Theodor Sturm. Heat flows on Time-dependent Metric Measure Spaces and Super-Ricci Flows. *arXiv:1611.02570*, 2017.

[15] Kazumasa Kuwada. Duality on gradient estimates and Wasserstein controls. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 258(11):3758–3774, 2010.

[16] Kazumasa Kuwada and Robert Philipowski. Coupling of Brownian motions and Perelman's L-functional. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 260(9):2742–2766, 2011.

[17] Janna Lierl and Laurent Saloff-Coste. Parabolic Harnack inequality for time-dependent non-symmetric Dirichlet forms. *arXiv:1205.6493*, 2012.

[18] Zhi Ming Ma and Michael Röckner. *Introduction to the theory of (nonsymmetric) Dirichlet forms*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1992.

[19] Giuseppe Savaré. Self-improvement of the Bakry-Émery condition and Wasserstein contraction of the heat flow in RCD(K,∞) metric measure spaces. *Discr. Cont. Dyn. Syst. A*, 34(4):1641–1661, 2014.

[20] Karl-Theodor Sturm. On the geometry of metric measure spaces. I and II. *Acta Math.*, 169(1):65–131, 2006.

[21] Karl-Theodor Sturm. Metric measure spaces with variable Ricci bounds and couplings of Brownian motions. In *Festschrift Masatoshi Fukushima*, volume 17 of *Interdiscip. Math. Sci.*, pages 553–575. World Sci. Publ., Hackensack, NJ, 2015.

[22] Karl-Theodor Sturm. Super Ricci flows for metric measure spaces. I. *arXiv:1603.02193*, 2016.

[23] Peter Topping. $\mathcal{L}$-optimal transportation for Ricci flow. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 636:93–122, 2009.

[24] C. Villani. *Optimal transport, old and new*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2009.